

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: West/Centre Area
Date: 24 July 2008

Ward: Osbaldwick
Parish: Osbaldwick Parish Council

Reference: 08/01236/FUL
Application at: 60 Meadlands Osbaldwick York YO31 0NS
For: Single storey side and rear extensions (following demolition of existing garage and conservatory), erection of front porch and dormers to front and rear
By: Mr Peter Fort
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 6 August 2008

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application is a resubmission of application 07/02863/FUL which was refused by the planning committee at the meeting on the 7th February of this year. The reason for refusal was as follows:

'The City of York Council considers that the development, by virtue of its design, size and scale will dominate the original building and when viewed from neighbouring properties would result in an overbearing and oppressive development which would lead to a significant loss of amenity to the detriment of the living conditions of these residents. As such the application is considered contrary to the City of York Draft Local Plan policies H7 and GP1 and the City of York Council Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses approved March 2001'.

1.2 Following the above decision, this resubmission introduces an amended design which reduces the size of the side and rear extensions and introduces dormer windows to the front and rear in order to create rooms in the roofspace.

1.3 The application site is set within a suburban street of a mostly spacious and open character within the urban area. The street is made up of individually designed dwellings of both bungalows and houses built in the 1960s with little or no one style pervading.

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 EXTERNAL.

3.2 Osbaldwick Parish Council.
No objections.

3.3 Neighbours / Third parties.
3 letters received making the following comments.

- i) The previous application was refused on the grounds of size and scale which would result in an overbearing development. Would question whether the redesigned frontage of two dormers and porch is in question with the scale and size of the original building.
- ii) Concerned about anti-social working hours.
- iii) This application does contain alterations which bring it more in keeping with the existing properties but concerned over the following:
 - the submitted plan should be strictly adhered to.
 - no details on drainage and this could lead to possible ground water problems. Any resulting damage to property, drains or gardens would need prior recognition.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 KEY ISSUES.

- i) Visual impact on the dwelling and the area.
- ii) Impact on the neighbouring properties.

4.2 Following on from the previous refusal, the main issue for members is whether the revised scheme addresses the reasons for refusal. In policy terms, GP1 and H7 of the draft local plan are relevant here. Policy GP1 (Design) includes reference to developments respecting the local environment in terms of scale, mass and design and respecting the amenity of neighbours through the avoidance of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing structures. Policy H7 (Residential extensions) essentially repeats this advice.

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

and the scale of the new extension should not dominate the original building. Regarding dormers the general rule is that they should not extend across more than one third of the roof span and should not dominate the existing roof. Dormer extensions should not be higher than the ridge of the roof of the original dwelling and front facing dormers that face towards a public highway should be small and in keeping with the style of the property. In most cases dormers should have pitched roofs or to match the style of the existing roof.

Visual impact on the dwelling and the area.

4.4 The property in question is single storey and stands within a mixed area of housing where no one architectural style stands out. There are a range of styles and sizes, including bungalows and two storey dwellings. The previous scheme introduced large rear and side extensions which, whilst not increasing the overall height of the property would have resulted in a much larger property. It introduced gables to the rear that projected deep into the rear garden close to the side boundary. It was this element which the Council considered to harm the amenity of the neighbours due to their overbearing and dominant impact and paid little regard to the size, scale and design of the existing building.

4.5 This amended scheme has removed these rear gable extensions completely and retained the existing side garage (with a hipped roof added) at single storey height. A rear extension remains but at a more conventional single storey height with a mono-pitch roof hipped into the existing building. The height to the ridge of the extension is 4.2 metres with an eaves height of 2.6 metres. It projects approx. 3.3 metres from the rear of the house and is 1.1 metres off the boundary. This compares to the previous scheme which projected 4.5 metres from the house and was 5.5 metres high. This scheme is much better related to the existing property and respects its existing scale and mass and largely retains the outward appearance of a modest single storey dwelling. The applicant was keen to introduce living accommodation at first floor level and this had manifested itself in the large, overly dominant scheme refused by the Planning committee. This revision still incorporates bedrooms and bathrooms at first floor level but dormer windows set into the existing roof have replaced the previous extension. There are 3 dormer windows but these are individually modest in size with pitched roofs. Officers do not consider them to dominate the roof or harm the amenity of the neighbours.

4.6 Two further dormers are proposed to the front, although these did form part of the previous scheme and were not part of the reason for refusal. Although the two dormers are closer together than in the previous scheme (the roof over the garage has now been deleted) they replicate the rear dormers in style and size. They have pitched roofs and are modest in size and do not dominate the existing roof. Officers consider these to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy H7 of the Draft Local Plan and the Councils supplementary planning guidance on dormer windows. The new front porch, whilst larger than existing is also considered to be appropriate to the property.

4.7 With regard to the wider streetscene, there are a range of styles and sizes of houses in Meadlands and other nearby roads and there are several examples of front and rear dormers windows, including some much larger ones than those

proposed here. Both neighbouring properties have rear dormer windows and no. 62 Meadlands also has a modest single storey rear extension. Given this and the varied style of the area, officers raise no objections to the development on the grounds of impact on the streetscene. At a distance of 30 metres to the properties opposite, officers do not consider the front dormers will harm the amenity of those residents.

Impact on the neighbouring properties.

4.8 The rear extensions in the previous scheme were visually bulky and prominent from the rear and their bulk and mass would have had a significant overbearing impact on the occupants of 58 and 62 Meadlands. This proposal deletes this massing and replaces it with a more modest single storey extension and dormers. Officers do not consider that these will appear overbearing to either neighbour. There will be some increased level of overlooking over neighbouring rear gardens from the dormer windows but this is largely at oblique angles and from out of bedrooms and a bathroom, neither of which are considered to be primary habitable rooms. Officers do not consider that this level of harm to be significant nor unreasonable in a residential area.

4.9 With regard to the other neighbour comments, the extent of the new development is not significant and it is not considered it will have any local implications on drainage. The impact of the proposal on the drainage system did not form part of the previous reason for refusal, therefore it would not be reasonable to introduce it in respect of this revised, more modest proposal. On the issue of anti-social working hours, given the modest size of the development, there is no reason that work would cause undue levels of nuisance in the area through deliveries etc. and officers do not consider it appropriate to impose a condition to control this. Other legislation is available to control this issue should the need arise.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 Officers consider that the amended proposal addresses the previous reasons for refusal and represents a much improved scheme. The overbearing and oppressive nature of the previous application has been deleted and replaced by a proposal much more representative of the size and scale of the existing property. It is further considered that there is no longer material harm being caused to the amenity of the neighbours as a result of the development. Officers therefore consider it to comply with policies H7 and GP1 of the draft local plan and the Council's supplementary planning guidance on extension and alterations to residential properties.

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 no's
- 07.21.24
- 07:21:PA21

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

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 design and appearance and neighbour amenity. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan (4th set of changes approved April 2005).

Contact details:

Author: Matthew Parkinson Development Control Officer
Tel No: 01904 552405