

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: West/Centre Area **Ward:** Osbaldwick
Date: 7 February 2008 **Parish:** Osbaldwick Parish Council

Reference: 07/02863/FUL
Application at: 60 Meadlands Osbaldwick York YO31 0NS
For: One and two storey pitched roof rear extension, single storey extension to side and pitched roof dormers to front
By: Mr And Mrs P Fort
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 31 January 2008

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application is for a one and two storey pitched roof rear extension, and a two storey side extension and two pitched roof dormers to the front roof slope.

1.2 The modestly designed detached dwelling is set within a suburban street of a spacious and open character. The street is made up of individually designed dwellings built in the 1960s and gives the street a distinctive character.

1.3 The application is called before committee at the request of Cllr. Jonathan Morley as the application would "have a major impact on the amenity of its neighbouring properties and is over development". As objections to the proposal have been received a site visit is required.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams East Area (1) 0003

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1
Design

CYH7
Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 PUBLICITY DATES/PERIODS

Neighbour Notification - Expires 10/01/2008

Site Notice - N/A

Press Advert - N/A

Internal/External Consultations - Expires 10/01/2008

8 WEEK TARGET DATE 31/01/2008

3.2 INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.3 EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

4 LETTERS OF OBJECTION

- Dwellings individually designed to give occupants space and light and views between dwellings
- The mass and scale of the extension would not be in keeping with the surrounding dwellings
- Proposed dormers are too large for the size of roof
- The proposed porch would be out of scale to the property
- The extension over the garage would block light and the outlook of the green belt from dwellings at the opposite side of the road
- Overdevelopment of the site
- It is proposed to lengthen the south elevation by 60% with a wall that is 56% higher than the existing rear wall. The construction of these walls would reduce light to the first floor gable end bedroom window in side elevation of 58 Meadlands facing 60 Meadlands leading to a loss light and outlook
- Increase floorspace by 160% resulting in a structure out of proportion, scale, and keeping with the other properties within the street.
- Concerns that there may be an increase in roof height
- Cause a loss of light and outlook to the first floor bedroom window, and two lounge windows in the side elevation of 62 Meadlands facing 60 Meadlands
- The proposed side elevation facing 62 Meadlands will have the appearance of a "warehouse wall"
- Would overwhelm the garden of 62 Meadlands, and would cause overshadowing by virtue of bulk, would impact significantly on the amenity of the garden
- No details of drainage, potential for possible ground water problems
- The construction would cause disturbance, noise, pollution and inconvenience

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

None

4.2 ADDITIONAL PLANNING POLICY

CYC Supplementary Design Guidance - A guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses, 2001

4.3 KEY ISSUES

1. Visual impact on the dwelling and the area
2. Impact on neighbouring property

4.4 ASSESSMENT

PLANNING POLICY

4.4.1 Policy GP1 'Design' of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan 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.

4.4.2 Policy H7 'Residential Extensions' of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan 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.

4.4.3 The City of York Council's supplementary planning guidance - Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses, states that the basic shape and size of the extension should be sympathetic to the design of the original dwelling. The scale of the new extension should not dominate the original building. Good design and a scale of development that respects the original dwelling and established pattern of development are essential to making a quality extension. As a general rule dormers should not extend across more than one third of the roof span and should not dominate the existing roof. Materials must also match the existing and be of a similar scale and proportion to the original dwelling. Dormer extensions should not be higher than the ridge of the roof of the original dwelling. Dormers that face to the front of the property towards a public highway road or footpath are not encouraged, unless they are small and in keeping with the style of the property. In most cases dormers should have pitched roofs, and be hipped or swept to match the style of the existing roof. In order to reduce the visual impact of two storey extensions the ridgeline should be lower than the original dwelling.

4.4.4 In order to reduce the visual impact of two storey extensions the ridgeline should be lower than the original dwelling. Side extensions should be sympathetically designed to appear subservient to the main dwelling. Their appearance will be improved if the extension is set back from the main dwelling. It is particularly important that the design of side extension takes account of the height of the new building in relation to the distance from neighbouring properties. When making a planning application it is important to consider the height and level of the site and the impact of a proposal on the internal and external spaces of neighbouring properties. A porch extension should be of a simple design and of a size which does not dominate the front elevation. The shape and materials should reflect the character of the main dwelling including the style of doors and windows.

VISUAL IMPACT ON THE DWELLING AND THE AREA

4.4.5 The modestly designed detached dwelling is set within a suburban street of a spacious and open character. The street is made up of individually designed dwellings built in the 1960s that give the street a distinctive character. The dwelling is smaller in height and has a shallower roof pitch than the neighbouring dwellings. A mature beech hedge marks the boundary of the plot and the rear of the property has an outlook over the open countryside.

4.4.6 The proposal would remove the front projection from the front elevation and would add two pitched roof dormers to the front roof slope and a glazed porch (4.1 metres in height). The existing garage to the side would be removed and a two-storey side extension would be built set back 0.45 metres (the original garage was set back 1.65 metres). The two storey elements would be added to the back with a single storey sunroom in between them. The increase in the footprint of the resultant dwelling from the original is approximately 47.33%. The extension would provide a garage, utility room, kitchen, sunroom and dining room at ground floor with four bedrooms (two with en-suite facilities) and a bathroom at first floor.

4.4.7 The proposed rear two storey elements are not set down from the height of the original roof, and the eaves would be raised by 1.3 metres. The proposed rear extension would be 4.5 metres in depth. The pitch of the original rear roof slope would be altered from 38 degree slope to a 12.5 degree slope to create additional accommodation within the roof space. The alterations to the pitch of the rear roof slope would give the rear elevation a rather atypical appearance, however, it is still possible to use matching roof tiles, notwithstanding the shallowness roof pitch. The proposed two storey extensions together with the change in the pitch of the rear roof slope would not retain the original character of the dwelling. However whilst the design at the rear removes the original character from the dwelling, the rear extensions would be only seen obliquely from the road and therefore impact on the streetscene would be minimal.

4.4.8 The proposal would introduce an unusual glazed feature breaking through the eaves of the bungalow and incorporating a pitched roof. The proposed pitched roof dormer windows would be set down from the original roof ridge and appear small in scale when viewed in context with the front elevation. The proposed front elevation would have a plainer appearance following the removal of the single storey pitched roof protruding element. However, on balance it is considered that the proposed alterations, including the proposed dormer windows, would not result in unacceptable harm to the streetscene and are acceptable. The front elevation is partially screened by the existing beech hedge and there are other examples of larger dormers within the streetscene. The dwelling is smaller in height than those on either side.

4.4.9 The proposed rear extension would be visually bulky and would be prominent from neighbouring rear gardens by virtue of the depth and the breaking of the first storey building line to the rear of the dwellings. However it is considered that refusal could not be recommended for the reason of overdevelopment as the dwelling is set within a large plot and space is retained to each side. Views of the extension from the public realm would be limited.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY

4.4.10 The proposed extensions would be likely to result in some additional overshadowing and loss of light to 62 Meadlands by virtue of the orientation of the building together with the increased bulk adjacent to the shared boundary and the proposed two storey rear extension. The side elevation of 62 Meadlands has two secondary lounge windows and a first floor bedroom window in the gable end facing the proposed extension. However, any increase in overshadowing and loss of light is not considered to be unduly harmful in this instance, particularly bearing in mind that the affected windows are not of a primary nature (in the case of the living room) or do not serve principal rooms (in the case of the bedroom). Number 58 Meadlands has a garage between the proposed extension and the dwelling that would provide screening, together with the distance (approx 8 metres) it is considered that there would be no significant loss of amenity.

4.4.11 The side elevations of the resultant dwelling would be 11.9 metres in depth. The height and siting of these extensions would lead to a loss of outlook from the first floor bedroom window of 62 Meadlands and to a lesser extent 58 Meadlands. However as the existing view from these windows is of the gable end of 60 Meadlands and oblique views overlooking 60 Meadlands it is not considered that this would result in a significant loss of amenity.

4.4.12 The rear extensions would be visually bulky and prominent from the rear, particularly as they would break through the eaves at the rear of the dwelling. However, the bulk and mass of the extension is not considered to be overbearing to the occupants of 62 Meadlands as they have no primary windows in the elevation facing 60 Meadlands, and a single storey rear extension which would screen some of the impact. No. 60 Meadlands has a relatively large rear garden, and therefore the impact of the extensions on the amenity of the garden area would be limited. The proposed side elevation would be 11.9 metres in depth and the height of the proposed two storey rear extensions would be 5.8 metres in height, albeit with an eaves height of 3.7 metres. However the roof slopes away from the boundary reducing any overbearing impact that may otherwise result.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 On balance, the design of the extension is considered to be satisfactory. The full impact of the rear extension is not visible from the public realm and is therefore not considered to adversely affect the streetscene. It is considered that the proposed alterations to the front elevation, including the proposed dormer windows, would not result in unacceptable harm to the streetscene, particularly bearing in mind the suburban character of the area. The proposed rear extension would be prominent from the rear gardens of the neighbouring dwellings but it is not considered to be unduly harmful to the amenity and living conditions of the occupants of these dwellings. Approval is recommended.

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:-

Drawing Number 07:21:PA1 received 6 November 2007;

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 VISQ1 Matching materials

4 VISQ8 Samples of exterior materials to be app

5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order) no additional windows, doors, or openings other than those shown on the approved plans shall be constructed.

Reason: As the insertion of additional windows could have a serious impact on the privacy of neighbours and should therefore be controlled.

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 visual amenity of the locality. As such, the proposal complies with Policies H7 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (2005).

Contact details:

Author: Victoria Bell Development Control Officer
Tel No: 01904 551347