

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: West/Centre Area
Date: 17 January 2008

Ward: Rural West York
Parish: Nether Poppleton Parish
Council

Reference: 07/02729/FUL
Application at: 45 Hillcrest Avenue Nether Poppleton York YO26 6LD
For: One and two storey pitched roof rear extension (resubmission)
By: Mr S Murray
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 15 January 2008

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application is for a single and two storey extension on the rear of this modern detached dwelling.

1.2 An application for a two storey rear extension across the full width of the house and a summer house to the rear of the existing garage was refused under reference 07/02183/FUL in November 2007 because of its impact on the living conditions of the neighbours.

1.3 Councillor Hudson has requested that the application be determined by Sub-Committee with a site visit based on the extension's potential to harm the amenity currently enjoyed by adjoining property occupiers.

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

CYH7
Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

NETHER POPPLETON PARISH COUNCIL

4.1 Object. The proposed extension is still very large. The window arrangements now increase the overlooking potential towards neighbouring properties. The gable end roof is closer to 43 Hillcrest Avenue providing even more accent of the building's mass. We recommend that the application be refused by virtue of its size, scale, mass and bulk together with an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy to the private amenity area belonging to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. We recommend that, in the event of Officer approval, that a site visit be arranged for the Planning Sub-Committee.

NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

4.2 Two letters of objection have been received (from 43 and 47 Hillcrest Avenue) objecting to the mass and scale of the extension and its potential to cause overlooking.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 Key issues: Impact on the character of the area, impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property occupiers.

4.2 Policy GP1 'Design' of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft 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.

4.3 Policy H7 'Residential Extensions' of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft sets out a list of design criteria against which proposals for house extensions are considered. The list includes the need to ensure that the design and scale are appropriate in relation to the main building; that proposals respect the character of area and spaces between dwellings; and that there should be no adverse effect on the amenity that neighbouring residents could reasonably expect to enjoy.

4.4 The Poppleton Village Design Statement SPG requires that scale, design and materials must be sympathetic and harmonise with neighbouring properties and spaces. Pitched roofs are encouraged.

4.5 The "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwellinghouses" SPG March 2001 recommends that the basic shape and size of the extension should be sympathetic to the design of the original house and its scale should not dominate the original building. Windows facing neighbouring properties may affect the privacy of neighbours and in most cases are not recommended. Proposals for extensions

which result in over 50% of the rear garden of the property being developed will not be permitted.

IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA.

4.6 The surrounding area is characterised by large detached properties set in relatively modest sized plots. The property is a two storey detached building with a detached garage. The buildings on site are constructed in brick with tiled roofs and white UPVC windows and doors.

4.7 The rear extension to the dwelling is proposed across 6.6m of the width of the property to the rear (whose overall width is 10.2m) and with a slightly lower ridge height than the existing dwelling, accommodating a kitchen and dining room at ground floor level and an en-suite bedroom at first floor level.

4.8 The SPG on residential extensions recommends that the basic shape and size of the extension should be sympathetic to the design of the original house and its scale should not dominate the original building. It is considered that the design and scale of the proposed extension is in keeping with the design of the existing dwelling and that it would not harm the character of the area. The proposal will retain an adequate rear garden area and maintains the existing spaces between dwellings.

OVERBEARING IMPACT.

4.9 The bulk of the proposed extension is adjacent to the boundary with 43 Hillcrest Avenue. The extension is slightly shorter (200mm) than the existing conservatory with the two storey element adjacent to 43 Hillcrest Avenue and the single storey element adjacent to 45a Hillcrest Avenue. The ground floor elements of the extensions are considered acceptable as they are screened by the various boundary treatments. With regard to the two storey element of the extension, the distance between the extension and the rear amenity area of the adjoining property means that although the outlook of 43 Hillcrest Avenue will be effected it will not be to such a degree as to cause harm. This scheme is approximately 0.5m shorter than the previously refused scheme with a reduction in the ridge line of the extension (as well as a reduction in width by almost a third), which all contribute to the overall reduction in scale of the extension.

LOSS OF PRIVACY.

4.10 Based on the position of the extension on the rear of the dwelling one bedroom at first floor level requires a new window in the gable elevation for natural light. The window has been positioned adjacent to the gable of the adjoining property and as such there would be no loss of privacy to the neighbours amenity space. An obscure glazed bathroom window already exists in this gable.

4.11 The proposed windows on the rear of the property, cause no more overlooking than those currently on the rear of the existing property. Whilst they are not the same style as those on the front of the property, this is the replication of the existing situation and as such considered acceptable. The windows serve the master bedroom and en-suite bathroom. The new window on the rear to serve bedroom 3

(nearest the south west boundary) would not cause any overlooking to 45a Hillcrest Avenue as it is in the same position as an existing window, albeit smaller in size.

4.12 It is not considered that the 4 proposed ground floor windows on the two gable elevations will cause a loss of privacy to adjoining neighbours, based on their position behind the boundary structures with the two neighbours, one behind a wall and the second behind a fence. Both boundary structures are approximately 1.8m in height. The windows on the rear of the ground floor extension (again serving the kitchen and dining room) will not cause a loss of privacy based on their position on the projecting rear extension. There are already ground floor windows on the rear of the property and as such the new windows will not cause any loss of privacy.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 Based on the above assessment of the currently submitted scheme (illustrating a two storey extension across approximately two thirds of the width of the rear of the property) the amenity currently enjoyed by the neighbouring property occupiers would not be harmed by the proposed extensions in terms of overlooking or overbearing and the design of the extension is considered acceptable.

5.2 As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan April 2005, guidelines 10, 12, 17 and 19 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Guidance August 2003 and the "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses" Supplementary Planning Guidance March 2001.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

1 TIME2 Development start within three years

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following plans:-

067.001 F;

or any plans or details subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as amendment to the approved plans.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

3 PD5 No additional openings in side elevations

4 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 design of the extension and its impact on the living conditions of the neighbours. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan April 2005, guidelines 10, 12, 17 and 19 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Guidance August 2003 and the "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses" Supplementary Planning Guidance March 2001.

Contact details:

Author: Emma Militis Planning Officer
Tel No: 01904 551493