

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: West/Centre Area
Date: 29 April 2008

Ward: Holgate
Parish: No Parish

Reference: 08/00301/FUL
Application at: 65 Moorgate York YO24 4HP
For: Two storey pitched roof side extension, single storey pitched roof front and rear extensions, after demolition of existing garage and conservatory (resubmission)
By: Mr R Wheller
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 7 April 2008

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey pitched-roof side extension along with single-storey front and rear extensions after demolition of existing garage and conservatory; in order to provide additional living space and replacement garage.

1.2 The two-storey element will project to the same level as the existing bay window to the front; and will project 3.1 metres to the side; and to the same height to the eaves and ridge as the existing dwelling. The single-storey front porch style extension will project to the same distance also. The single storey rear extension will project 3.3 metres from the existing rear elevation, with a length of 10.7 metres and will have a height of 2.2 metres to the eaves and 3.9 metres to the highest point.

1.3 This application has been called-in to Sub Committee by Councillor Denise Bowgett because there are other houses in the vicinity that have similar extensions.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Air safeguarding Air Field safeguarding 0175

DC Area Teams West Area 0004

Schools Acomb Primary 0182

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1
Design

CYH7
Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Response to neighbour consultation letters which expired on 12.03.08.

Two letters received from neighbouring residents, the first stating no objection, but wish to ensure the grass verge to the front of the property is protected during building works, second letter from no. 63 Moorgate raises objection regarding overshadowing to rear garden; scale, massing and design of proposal, dominating original dwelling and causing terracing effect; loss of outlook from front windows; maintenance issues.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The key planning issues are:

- Visual impact on the dwelling and surrounding area;
- Impact on neighbouring properties.

Development Control Local Plan Policy

4.2 Policy CYH7 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.

4.3 Policy CYGP1 states that development proposals will be expected to (i) respect or enhance the local environment, (ii) 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; (iii) avoid the loss of open spaces, important gaps within development, vegetation, water features and other features that contribute to the quality of the local environment; (iv) retain, enhance and/or create urban spaces, public views, skyline, landmarks and other townscape features which make a significant contribution to the character of the area, and take opportunities to reveal such features to public view; and (v) ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

4.4 'A Guide to Extensions and Alterations to Private Dwelling Houses' March 2001 states that good design and a scale of development that respects the original dwelling and established pattern of development are essential to making a quality extension. An extension in the style of the existing dwelling is likely to be the most acceptable. It further states that the basic shape and size of the extension should be sympathetic to the design of the original house and that the scale of the extension should not dominate the original building. Side extensions should be subservient, there appearance will be improved if the extension is set back from the main building.

National Planning Policy

4.5 Planning Policy Statement 1 states that it is the Government's objective to ensure high quality development through good and inclusive design (paragraph 5). It goes on to state in paragraph 34 that this applies to all development and design which is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

Relevant Planning History

4.6 Application No. 07/01865/FUL - Two-storey pitched roof side extension, single storey pitched roof front and rear extensions, after demolition of existing garage and conservatory - Withdrawn 25.09.07.

Assessment

4.7 This traditional style detached house is sited within a spacious residential area, outside of the conservation area. The street is largely made up of detached and semi-detached two-storey dwellings, sited within large plots. A long detached garage and attached conservatory are currently sited to the rear within a large garden.

4.8 The previous submission was withdrawn, which showed a similar scheme, but with a two-storey rear projection. This element was considered to cause harm to the neighbouring property and has now been removed from the scheme, with the two-storey element being sited only to the side.

4.9 The proposed additions are large in scale in relation to the original dwelling, and do not give a subservient appearance. The proposed gable feature mirrors that of the existing dwelling and the scale and design. Considered in isolation the proposal would not harm the appearance of the existing dwelling given the detached nature of the property. Though close to the neighbouring property at No. 63 Moorgate, a gap of approximately 1 metre will still be retained on no.63s side of the boundary; it is considered that this along with the lower ridge height at the host dwelling will not result in a terracing effect sufficient to justify the refusal of the application.

4.10 However, the large existing space between the host dwelling and this neighbouring property will be lost. The character of the surrounding area is of large plots with clear spaces between dwellings. It is considered, therefore, that the proposal will cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, due to the bulk of the proposal adjacent to the boundary.

4.11 The main impact upon neighbouring properties will be upon No. 63 Moorgate. The proposed side extension will project in front of the adjacent windows to this neighbouring property, however, it is not considered this would cause significant detriment, due to loss of light or outlook. Some loss of light may occur to the first floor bathroom window, however this is not a primary habitable room. Again, though some evening overshadowing to the neighbouring rear garden may occur, it is not considered to be of severe detriment, bearing in mind the size of the garden to be

enjoyed. It is not considered any loss of amenity will be caused due to the siting of the rear extension to any neighbouring properties, particularly further to the removal of the existing large garage.

4.12 The treatment of the grass verge to the front cannot be conditioned as part of the planning process. Neither can future maintenance issues be a material consideration.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that the proposal will cause harm to the spacious appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to policy GP1 which expects development proposals to respect or enhance the local environment and be of a scale and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings, spaces and the character of the area and policy H7 which requires proposals to respect the spaces between dwellings. The proposal is also contrary to the City Council's "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses" in that it fails to respect the established pattern of development.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 The proposed extension, by virtue of the scale and massing in proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property, would harm the visual amenity of the surrounding area, which is characterised by spacious plots with clear gaps between dwellings.

This would be contrary to the Development Control Local Plan policy GP1 which expects development proposals to respect or enhance the local environment and be of a scale and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings, spaces and the character of the area and policy H7 which requires proposals to respect the spaces between dwellings. The proposal is also contrary to the City Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance "Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses" in that it fails to respect the established pattern of development and Planning Policy Statement 1 which states that development and design which is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

Contact details:

Author: Gareth Arnold Area Team Leader

Tel No: 01904 551320