

DELEGATED REPORT

Date: 6 October 2016 **Ward:** Rural West York
Team: Householder and **Parish:** Parish Of Rufforth With
Small Scale Team Knapton

Reference: 16/01635/FUL
Application at: 30 Southfield Close Rufforth York YO23 3RE
For: Roof extensions including raising height of ridge, erection of front gable extension, side and rear extensions and new detached garage with access from rear (revised scheme)
By: Mr Alex Kirby
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 22 September 2016
Recommendation: Householder Approval

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks permission for extensions and alterations to the existing bungalow to include raising the ridge height of the roof and front gable, rear extensions, and detached garage to rear.

1.2 Amendments to the scheme have been submitted including the omission of the secondary front gable, hipping the roof to the north elevation, removal of first floor side window to ensuite, removal of large glazed window to the side of no. 28 and changes to the front elevation materials from render to matching brick.

1.3 Due to the significant nature of the alterations the application has been called to committee by Councillor Chris Steward.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation: Air safeguarding: Air Field safeguarding

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design
CYH7 Residential extensions
CYGB1 Green Belts
CYGB2 Development in settlements "Washed Over" by the Green Belt

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

Public Protection

3.1 No objections to the scheme subject to a condition requiring an electrical charging socket for electric vehicles.

EXTERNAL

Rufforth Parish Council

3.2 Object to the scheme. Regarding the original application and revisions made to it, the design and scale of the proposed building is inappropriate as it will have a huge impact on the street scene. The existing 2 bedroom traditional bungalow will become a 2-storey 4x bedroom property with gym and adjoining double garage. It will be entirely out of character to the adjacent row of eight bungalows which create a low and consistent roof line that wraps around the eastern perimeter of Southfield Close. The impact of the increased height of the proposed extension (an increased height of over 2.5 metres) is made worse as the property is located at the highest point of the cul-de-sac. It will also have a very dominant frontage as compared to adjoining properties. This will cause an over dominant effect on the street scene and significantly over-shadow the neighbouring bungalows.

Ainsty Internal Drainage Board

3.3 The proposed extensions are likely to cause additional surface water discharge in an area where localised flooding already exists. No objections to the scheme in principle providing adequate surface water drainage scheme is provided.

Publicity and Neighbour Notification

3.4 The application was advertised by neighbour notification letter. Letters of objection have been received from nine neighbouring properties. Two letters of support have been received from the previous owner of the host dwelling. The following objections have been received:

Original Proposals:

- use of the rear lane for vehicle access to the property as it is a quiet footpath with access for emergency vehicles only
- design and scale of proposals are inappropriate in relation to surrounding properties (8 bungalows of similar height). The alterations would be dominant and overpowering in the corner of the cul-de-sac as the increase in roof height would be 2.5m above existing bungalows and would result in a dominant frontage

- work/disruption would go on for months as the applicant has suggested he will be doing a lot of the work himself
- design and materials not sympathetic to the dwelling/locality. Proposals have no respect for existing development.
- amount of additional glazing/balcony would result in a loss of privacy to no. 28 and 32 and would lead to a large proportion of no. 28 garden being overlooked.
- large ground floor openings and two storey atrium would result in noise and intrusion to neighbours. It is possible that the two storey atrium could be converted and a first floor added resulting in more loss of privacy.
- scale of proposals would result to significant increase in risk of flooding to neighbouring buildings
- property located on highest part of the street which would exacerbate the scale of the development
- the steep roof pitch is out of character with the area
- windows, roof tiles, red bricks would be out of character with dwelling.
- remodelling to front may result in difficulty in finding matching bricks
- large expanse of glazing could lead to light pollution and would be out of character with rural setting of village which would have a significant visual presence.
- all existing extensions to properties respect the design and materials of the street
- works started before consent given
- proposals are against guidelines in the Rufforth Village Design Statement
- the heights of the houses were designed to allow for descending aircraft to the airfield
- the double garage would cause overshadowing to no. 32.

Revised Proposals:

- revisions don't address concerns
- only ground floor development should be allowed
- residents have already experienced weekend working and there is concern that if approval given there will be work around the clock at a huge disturbance to residents for many months.

4.0 APPRAISAL

KEY ISSUES:-

- Visual impact on the dwelling and the area
- Impact on the openness of the green belt
- Impact on neighbouring property
- Use of rear lane for vehicular access
- Drainage

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) sets out 12 core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Of particular relevance here 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. 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.

4.2 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.

4.3 Draft Local Plan Policy GP1 expects new development to respect or enhance the local environment, and be of a density, layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings, spaces and the character of the area, using appropriate building materials.

4.4 Draft 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 (iv) proposals respect the spaces between dwellings; and (v) the proposed extension does not result in an unacceptable reduction in private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

4.5 Draft Local Plan Policy GB2 states that within the defined settlement limits for villages in the green belt, planning permission for the extension of existing buildings will be permitted provided the proposed development would be located within the built-up area of the settlement; the location, scale and design of the proposed development would be appropriate to the form and character of the settlement and neighbouring property; and the proposed development would constitute limited infilling and would not prejudice the openness or the purposes of the Green Belt.

4.6 The Council have an agreed Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and Alterations' dated December 2012 which provides guidance on all types of domestic types of development.. A basic principle of this guidance is that any extension should normally be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the road/streetscene it is located on. In particular, care should be taken to ensure that the proposal does not dominate the

house or clash with its appearance with the extension/alteration being subservient and in keeping with, the original dwelling. The character of spacing within the street should be considered and a terracing effect should be avoided. Proposals should not unduly affect neighbouring amenity with particular regard to privacy, overshadowing and loss of light, over-dominance and loss of outlook. Guidance in sections 3 (privacy), 4 (overshadowing and loss of light), 5 (dominance and outlook), 13 (rear extensions), 14 (roof extensions), 15 (detached garages) and 18 (extensions in the green belt) are relevant to the determination of the application.

4.7 Rufforth Village Design Statement (guidelines 16 – 19, 21) states that extensions should harmonise with neighbouring properties and spaces, that the height of buildings should be in keeping with adjacent properties and maintain informal building lines, as well as maintain a mixture of building styles and sizes and that materials should be in sympathy with the existing.

THE SITE

4.8 The host building is a detached bungalow situated on a corner plot at the head of a long cul-de-sac which is comprised of a mix of two storey dwellings and bungalows. No. 30 is situated in a row of eight bungalows but opposite are two storey dwellings with some two storey dwellings to the rear. Southfield Lane runs along the rear of the host dwelling and it is from this lane which the applicant intends to create the main vehicular access to the property. Footings have been dug for the garage and alterations made to the garden for the rear driveway however no further work has taken place.

VISUAL IMPACT ON THE DWELLING AND AREA

4.9 It is proposed to construct a number of extensions to the existing bungalow to convert it into a one and a half storey 4/5 bedroom dwelling. Alterations are proposed to all elevations, including raising the roof by 2.5m, widening the front gable by approximately 1.5m, conversion of the garage into habitable accommodation including a 2.8m rear extension, a 7m rear feature gable with double height atrium and raising the roof height of the secondary rear gable to include a glazed balcony/terrace. A detached double garage is also proposed to the side of the dwelling. Alterations to the front of the dwelling would be carried out in matching buff brick and vertical clad timber boarding with both sides of the dwelling being rendered. The rear of the elevation would comprise a glazed oak frame and red brick. The roof would be finished in red concrete interlocking tiles to match neighbouring dwellings.

4.10 It is acknowledged that the proposals would result in a significant change to the existing dwelling, and that the alterations have attracted a number of objections from neighbouring residents with regard to the scale, height, mass and materials as the resultant dwelling is considered to be of a design and scale not in keeping with

the Close. Whilst the alterations would result in a considerable increase in scale from the existing bungalow, it is considered that the larger than average corner plot, coupled with the two storey houses opposite and to the rear, as well as the mix of dwellings within the cul-de-sac would give enough variation in the street, as supported by the Rufforth Village Design Statement, so that the proposed dormer bungalow would not appear overly incongruous in this part of the cul-de-sac and would not result in significant harm to the appearance of the street scene. Care has been taken to keep the front of the property as in-keeping with neighbouring properties as possible, with buff brick and timber cladding to the gable which reference neighbouring bungalows. The massing of the roof has also been scaled down with the removal of the second front gable and providing a hipped roof adjacent to no. 32. As such the majority of the additional massing and more contemporary design features have been positioned to the rear so as to limit the impact on the streetscene.

4.11 Concerns have been raised that the increased height and incorporation of the garage into the main dwelling would result in the dwelling appearing dominant and overpowering in the street frontage. The property is set back within the plot and the majority of the footprint would be set behind that of both neighbouring bungalows. The increase in height will be apparent in this location; it is not considered that the proposals would appear unduly dominant as adequate spacing has been retained to either side of the dwelling as required by Local Plan policies GP1 and H7.

4.12 It is acknowledged that the alterations will be visible from the rear lane, especially since it is proposed to relocate the main vehicular access to the rear, however the extensions and increase in roof height would be a reasonable distance from the lane, and the scale of the building would be viewed similarly to other two storey dwellings adjacent to the lane. Concerns have been raised regarding light pollution from the amount of glazing to the rear, however the glazing is to be tinted to prevent significant glare to neighbouring properties and users of the rear lane. It is also noted that the rear lane and gardens are bounded by mature trees and hedging which would also soften the impact of the development.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

4.13 No. 28 Southfields Close is situated south of the application site. The owner/occupants of this property have significant objections to the increase in scale, the overall increase in height, as well as the impact on amenity with regards to loss of privacy, increased noise and overshadowing. Currently the shared side boundary between the two properties comprises a mature hedge approximately 2.5m in height. It is noted that just the roof of no. 30, as well as the glazed roof of the conservatory is visible above this hedge. Given the nature of the proposals, the eaves height will be increased by approximately 300mm to 2.5m. The side elevation adjacent to no. 28 has been kept relatively simple and as such there will mostly be roof visible above the existing boundary hedge. It is acknowledged that that 7m

gable extension, having a height of approximately 7m is a significant addition; however there are no windows to this elevation that would overlook the neighbouring property. Whilst the extension may appear prominent, the main habitable rooms of no. 28 face down the garden rather than looking directly at no. 30 and given the generous rear garden of no. 28 it is not considered that the increase in mass of the host dwelling would have a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity. Given the orientation of both properties it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of light to this property.

4.14 Concerns have also been expressed by no. 28 regarding loss of privacy from the proposed balcony/terrace to the master bedroom over their rear garden. The terrace would be positioned 3m behind the main rear gable thereby affording privacy to both the applicants and neighbours by preventing views across the neighbouring garden. Views would also be restricted over the garden of no. 32 due to the location and oblique angle of the balcony in relation to no. 32. It is therefore not considered that the proposals would cause an undue loss of privacy to either immediate neighbour.

4.15 No. 32 Southfield Close is located north of the application site in close proximity to the shared side boundary which is bounded by a 2m high mature hedge. A detached double pitched roof garage is proposed adjacent to the side boundary with no. 32, set back from the side elevation of the host dwelling, having a footprint of 6m x 6m, an eaves height of 2.1m and a ridge height of 4.5m. The main living accommodation is situated at the front of no.32 with 2no. bedrooms to the rear overlooking the garden. Given the location of the garage in relation to the boundary, it is possible that the ridge would be partly visible from the rear rooms of no. 32, however at present the side boundary hedge has been left to grow up, thereby reducing visibility of any of the extensions from this vantage point. Given the height of the garage adjacent to the boundary, even with its southerly orientation, it is unlikely that it would cause significant overshadowing over and above the existing hedge. The only side window facing towards the application site would appear to be an obscurely glazed bathroom window which is currently obscured by the boundary hedge. Given that the habitable rooms are located away from the proposed development it is not considered that the increase in height and extensions to no. 30 would have a significant impact on light levels to habitable rooms and therefore the impact on residential amenity would be limited.

USE OF SOUTHFIELD LANE FOR MAIN VEHICLE ACCESS

4.16 A number of objections have been raised with regard to the use of the rear access lane as the main vehicle access to the dwelling as it has mainly been used as a public right of way and footpath to the cemetery as well as being utilised by emergency vehicles for access to the airfield. However Southfield Lane was once a County Unclassified Road linking Rufforth to Askham Bryan and still carries public vehicular rights along it including to the rear of no. 30. As such the Local Authority

is unable to prevent such use and because the lane is unclassified there is no requirement for the applicant to obtain planning permission for such use. Highways consent for the creation of the access is required however, and the applicant has submitted details as part of the application to show that Highways consent has been obtained.

DRAINAGE

4.17 The Ainsty Internal Drainage Board states that the watercourses in this area are known to be subject to high flows during storm events and Rufforth has a history of localised flooding. Soak-aways are not normally suitable in Rufforth. A Yorkshire Water surface water sewer exists in Southfield Close which then drains to a drainage ditch in Bradley Lane. The scale of the extension is not significant in drainage terms and any additional surface water run-off would be difficult to attenuate. A drainage condition is not recommended in these circumstances and drainage details should be dealt with under the Building Regulations.

GREEN BELT AND OTHER ISSUES

4.13 The 2005 Draft Local Plan defines Rufforth as a village washed-over by the Green Belt. The bungalow is located within the settlement limits defined in that Plan. The principle of washed-over settlements no longer forms part of Government guidance as expressed in the NPPF, paragraph 86 stating that “if it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used.....and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.” Policies YH9(C) and Y1 (C1 and C2) of the Regional Spatial Strategy require that the inner and the rest of the outer boundaries are defined to protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental character of York, including its historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas. The 2013 Publication Draft of the Local Plan proposes to exclude the village from the Green Belt and although this Plan carries limited weight it is considered that the application site does not meet any of the 5 Green Belt purposes and should not be considered as forming part of the Green Belt for the purposes of this application.

4.14 With regard to the increase in height affecting the flight path of aircraft using Rufforth Airfield, the Aerodrome has been consulted and no comments received. The site has a backdrop of mature trees and there are two storey dwellings opposite therefore it is not considered that the increase in height would have any impact on the safety of the airfield. A note to the Airfield Safeguarding Map states the Map does not apply to householder type development.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Application Reference Number: 16/01635/FUL

Page 8 of 10

5.1 It is acknowledged that the proposed alterations and extensions to the bungalow will result in a significant change to the height and massing of the dwelling, however given the various property styles in the cul-de-sac, the scale of the plot and the retention of matching materials to the front of the dwelling, the proposed changes are considered to harmonise with the various heights of dwellings in the vicinity that would not result in a dominant or overbearing structure in the street scene. Similarly given the orientation of the development in relation to neighbouring properties and the design and layout of the proposals it is not considered that the proposals would have a significant impact on residential amenity. As such the scheme is considered to comply with guidance in the NPPF, draft Local Plan policies GP1 and, H7, design principles in the Rufforth Village Design Statement and the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Householder Approval

1 TIME2 Development start within three years

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

Proposed plans and elevations - Drg. No: 2016-81-02 Rev. F

Proposed Site Plan and Garage Plan - Drg. No: 2016-81-03 Rev. B

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

3 Prior to the development hereby approved coming into use, a three pin 13 amp external electrical socket which is also suitable for outdoor use shall be installed. The socket shall be located in a suitable position to enable the charging of an electric vehicle within the garage or on the driveway using a 3m length cable.

Note: Any socket provided must comply with BS1363, or an equivalent standard, Building Regulations and be suitable for charging electric vehicles. It should also have a weatherproof cover and an internal switch should be also provided in the property to enable the socket to be turned off.

Reason: To promote sustainable transport through the provision of recharging facilities for electric vehicles. To promote the use of low emission vehicles on the site in accordance with paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The double height space to the rear of the property shall not be converted to provide further accommodation at first floor level without a further planning

Application Reference Number: 16/01635/FUL

permission first being granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties as the living accommodation at this level may result in unacceptable levels of overlooking because of the proposed glazed gable

5 Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order), development of the type described in Classes B (the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof) and C (other alterations to the roof of a dwellinghouse) of Schedule 2 Part 1 of that Order shall not be erected or constructed.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the adjoining residents the Local Planning Authority considers that it should exercise control over any future extensions or alterations which, without this condition, may have been carried out as "permitted development" under the above classes of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.

7.0 INFORMATIVES: Notes to Applicant

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 order to achieve a positive outcome:

Officers have secured revisions to materials and the scale of building so that it appears more in keeping with neighbouring buildings and doesn't dominate the street scene.

Contact details:

Author: Elizabeth Potter Development Management Assistant

Tel No: 01904 551477