

## COMMITTEE REPORT

**Committee:** East Area

**Ward:** Haxby And Wigginton

**Date:**

**Parish:** Wigginton Parish Council

**Reference:** 08/01678/FUL

**Application at:** Rosevale Private Residential Home 33 The Village Wigginton  
York YO32 2PR

**For:** Two storey extension to create additional bedrooms and storage facilities and single storey rear extension to create communal facilities and office space

**By:** Wellburn Care Ltd

**Application Type:** Full Application

**Target Date:** 22 August 2008

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks planning permission for a first and two storey rear extension and a rear conservatory at Rosevale Private Residential Home which is located at 33 The Village. Rosevale is not within a conservation area neither is it listed. Rosevale operates 24 hours a day 365 days a year and provides care for the elderly.

1.2 At present there are 39 bedrooms and associated communal space within Rosevale. The proposal increases the amount of internal floorspace from 1035 sq m to 1360 sq m with an increase in the number of bedrooms by 2 to a total of 41. The proposed extension is part of a general redevelopment of the whole site with en-suites being added to all rooms and better communal and care facilities provided.

1.3 This application is being referred to Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Firth who has concerns about the impact on the living conditions of residents living at 33b The Village. It is felt that a site visit is needed to understand the relationship between the application site and the dwellings at 33b The Village and Beech House which is located on Back Lane.

### 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams East Area (2) 0005

Schools Wigginton Primary 0238

## 2.2 Policies:

CYGP1  
Design

CYH17  
Residential institutions

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS

### INTERNAL

3.1 Highway Network Management - The proposed extensions would only create a net increase of 2 bedrooms and therefore there are no material changes in highway terms. No objections.

3.2 Drainage - The application site is within Flood Zone 1 and should not suffer from flooding. However, sufficient details regarding surface water drainage have not been submitted which would determine the impact on downstream watercourses. (This has been discussed with the Drainage Department and the applicant and it was agreed that this could be controlled by condition.)

3.3 Environmental Protection Unit - No objections.

### EXTERNAL

3.4 Wigginton Parish Council - No objections but there are concerns about construction traffic accessing Back Lane and Church Lane, these are used by children going to and from school. Hours of delivery should be conditioned and contractors vehicles should be parked off-road.

3.5 Neighbours - Letters received from two neighbours. Comments were received from 34 The Village which is opposite and 33b The Village which is immediately to the west of Rosevale. No comments regarding the revised plans had been received at the time of writing the report but the following comments were made in regard to the original proposal:

- Concern about the access for developers and where they would park, there is only a small parking area to the front and this is needed by staff and visitors;
- A number of cars already park along The Village and any addition to this would be unacceptable to local residents;
- Concerns regarding the height and length of the proposed extension and the impact this will have on the amount of natural light entering the rear garden, conservatory, and patio area;
- It is beneficial that the proposal has been designed with no windows overlooking the rear of 33b The Village;
- Concerned about the noise, dust and intrusion that a major construction problem will cause;

- Concern about the bedroom window in the side elevation of Rosevale which would overlook the front garden of 33b The Village.

## **4.0 APPRAISAL**

4.1 The Key Issues are:

- Visual Impact / Design
- Impact on the Living Conditions of Neighbours
- Highways
- Drainage

### **VISUAL IMPACT / DESIGN**

4.2 The single storey rear extension to the conservatory is small in scale and would not have a significant impact on the appearance of the building. The two storey rear extension has a relatively low ridge height which ensures that it sits below the height of the main building which fronts onto The Village. Therefore the extensions will not be visually prominent from The Village and will not significantly affect the character and appearance of the streetscene.

4.3 The proposal also incorporates a first storey extension above an existing ground floor offshoot. The original offshoot is also extended by 5.7m to the rear ending with an L shaped design. The extension appears reasonably well proportioned in relation to the main building. The roof slope reflects the design and pitch of those on the existing building. A condition can be added to any approval to ensure that building materials used match those of the existing building in order to ensure an acceptable finished quality to the extensions.

### **NEIGHBOUR AMENITY**

4.4 Concerns have been expressed regarding the impact of the proposed extension on the living conditions of neighbours living at 33b The Village to the west and Beech House to the south. As a result of this revised plans were submitted which seek to overcome any concerns. Firstly considering Beach House. The proposed two storey extension would be approximately 15m from the rear elevation and 3.4m from the curtilage boundary of Beach House. It is considered that given the separation distance and the relatively modest height of the extension (5.2m to the eaves), combined with some existing natural landscaping along the boundary will ensure that the structure would not appear dominant or overbearing when viewed from the dwelling and rear garden of Beach House. The extension would be north of Beech House and therefore would not have any significant impact on the amount of natural light entering the dwelling.

4.5 The original plans contained two bedroom windows within the rear elevation which were considered to overlook the curtilage of Beech House and therefore result in a loss of privacy. However, the plans have been revised whereby only one first storey window is located within the rear elevation and this would serve an assisted bathroom. It is considered appropriate to add a condition whereby this window is

obscure glazed in order to protect the privacy of users of the care home and the residents of Beech House. It is considered that the revised plans would not harm the living conditions which residents of Beech House could reasonably expect to enjoy. No letters of objection have been received from residents of Beech House.

4.6 A letter of objection was received from 33b The Village regarding the impact of the proposed extension on their living conditions. The revised plans attempt to overcome these concerns. No first storey windows other than rooflights are proposed for the west elevation and therefore there are no issues in terms of overlooking and a loss of privacy for residents of 33b.

4.7 The proposed extension runs parallel to the curtilage boundary of 33b The Village. The extension would protrude backwards approximately 13m from the main rear elevation of 33b The Village. However, an access path of approximately 4m sits between the proposed extension and the curtilage boundary with 33b The Village. The main house is also set back from the boundary by approximately 2.3m with a store room siting between the house and its curtilage boundary. In addition to this the first storey of the extension is set in 1.3m from the ground floor extension to allow some extra separation distance at this level. This gives a separation distance between the house and the proposed extension of approximately 7.6 m. It is considered that the structure would not appear overbearing at this distance. Only the first storey of the extension would be visible from the ground floor of 33b The Village, which has a 2m high boundary wall located on the curtilage boundary. The extension may have some impact on the amount of morning light entering the curtilage of 33b The Village, but given the separation distance, on balance the proposal is considered to be satisfactory.

4.8 The original plan contained a bedroom window which would overlook the front garden of 33b The Village. The revised plan has removed this element to ensure that there is no loss of privacy for the residents of the neighbouring house.

## HIGHWAYS

4.9 The proposed development is part of major refurbishment of Rosevale. This includes significant internal works within the existing building to create larger rooms for residents and to incorporate en-suite bathrooms. Many of these works do not require planning consent. The net result of the extension together with the internal works is that two additional bedrooms only would be created. This increase is very minor in relation to the size of the care home as a whole. It is therefore not considered that there would be any significant increase in vehicle movements associated with the care home. There would be little change in terms of staff and visitor numbers and no highways objections are raised.

4.9 Concerns were raised by local residents and the Parish Council regarding traffic associated with the construction of the extensions. Heavy goods traffic and traffic associated with workers is inevitable for any kind of major development. The control of this is very difficult within the planning system. Should planning permission be granted a condition could be attached to control construction times and to ensure that no loading or unloading takes place outside of the application site if this is considered necessary. It is not considered necessary to condition construction traffic

routes to and from the site given the size of the proposed development. In any event, such conditions are not encouraged by Circular 11/95 "The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions".

## DRAINAGE

4.10 Although the site is within Flood Zone 1, York Consultancy have raised concerns regarding the lack of a surface water drainage report. However, it has been agreed that a condition can be attached to any approval whereby surface drainage details are agreed and implemented prior to occupation of the extension. A surface water flow restrictor can be installed to ensure that the proposed development does not create a greater level of surface runoff which may have implications in the surrounding area or downstream.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable subject to suitable conditioning.

## 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:-

Revised Plans Drawing Numbers AL(0)000, AL(0)042 Rev F, AL(0)004 Rev D, and AL(0)005 Rev G

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 Prior to the commencement of development details of a scheme for the provision and maintenance of a surface water regulation system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by The Local Planning Authority. The surface water regulation system shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the extensions.

Reason: To ensure that surface water runoff is controlled to reduce the risk of flooding.

5 Other than those shown on the approved plans no first storey windows or other openings shall be inserted into the west or south elevations of the extension hereby approved without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the privacy of residents of neighbouring properties.

6 The first storey window in the south elevation of the extension hereby approved shall be obscure glazed to a standard equivalent to Pilkington Glass level 3 and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To protect the privacy of residents of neighbouring properties.

7 NOISE7 Restricted hours of construction

## **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:

- Visual Impact / Design
- Impact on the Living Conditions of Neighbours
- Highway issues
- Drainage

As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H17 of the City of York Draft Local Plan.

### **Contact details:**

**Author:** Michael Jones Development Control Officer  
**Tel No:** 01904 551325