

1.5 It is noticed that although the drawings appear to be made to 1:100 scale, the scale on the plans is not accurate above 5 metres.

1.6 A Committee Site Visit is requested to view the relationship between the buildings and proposed extension.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

1.7 Application 05/01303/FUL proposing a two storey side extension was withdrawn.

1.8 Application reference 06/00862/FUL for a two storey side extension, was refused in August 2006. This application proposed a two storey side extension with hipped roof. This extension was pulled back at first floor level from the rear by 2 metres at first floor level. The report states this was a borderline case, but that on balance that it should be refused due to the side extension's bulk and proximity to the overbearing impact upon neighbours.

1.9 Application reference 08/01216/FUL for a two storey side and single storey rear extension was approved July 2008. This application proposed a two storey side extension with swept roof. The application was revised and the proposed two storey extension was pulled in from the rear elevation of the existing property by 1.5 metres at first floor level. This combination of revised design and reduced depth at first floor level was considered to reduce the impact upon the neighbouring property and make the application acceptable.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

DC Area Teams : West Area 0004

Schools : St. Paul's CE Primary 0229

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design

CYH7 Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS:

3.1 HIGHWAY NETWORK MANAGEMENT: There are no objections in principle to the scheme, and it is noted that the proposal will result in the loss of one parking space. However the dwelling is in close proximity to the city centre and has good public transport links covered and secure cycle parking is provided, no highway objections are raised. The following condition HWAY 19 Car and Cycle Parking Laid Out to be applied.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

3.2 A letter of objection has been received from the neighbouring occupier. Commenting that no. 3 is one of the only properties that does not have a drive. The proposed extension is unique as no other property has such an extension. The properties have provided adequately for larger families than at present. The height of the extension will require sufficient foundations and as such may impact upon the Party Wall Act. Also because of the unique corner position any area for private amenity is restricted to the side and rear of the kitchen of number 3, which would be in close proximity to the development. The application has been revised, but it would still be built to the boundary edge in the direction of this property. We still feel this is a sizeable development based on the size of the plot. The overall effect is the same as last time, i.e. overbearing close proximity which would result in the loss of residential amenity. This remains a two storey development of which there is no precedent on this street. The architectural hierarchy and elements are not sympathetic to the existing building and it resembles a 1980s extension. Despite approval of the previous application another application is being pursued. The original approval should stand and this application be refused. We request that these concerns be borne in mind whilst making a decision.

4.0 APPRAISAL

POLICY

4.1 Policies H7, GP1 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 'A Guide to Extensions and Alterations to Private Dwelling Houses' March 2001 apply. Planning Policy Statement 'Delivering Sustainable Development' PPS1 also applies.

4.2 National planning policy contained within PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development', states that good design is indivisible from planning. Design which is inappropriate within its context, or which fails to take opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area or the way it functions should not be accepted.

4.3 Policy H7 'Residential Extensions' of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft 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 Policy GP1 'Design' of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft 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.

4.5 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. Where a street or group of buildings has a well-defined building line it should be retained. It is suggested that side extensions should be set back at least 0.5 metres from the front of the building. Extending forward of the building line should be avoided. 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 building. It is particularly important that the design of side extensions takes account of the height of the new building in relation to the distance from neighbouring properties. Extensions that go up to the property boundary may result in a 'terracing effect'. It is exacerbated when the ridgeline continues at the same level. If the spaces between houses become filled by side extension in this way it can alter the character of an area and produce a terracing effect. If sufficient space is available leaving a space between the extension and the boundary of about one metre will allow for maintenance of the side of the extension. The extension can be set back from the original building line and have a lower ridge height, thus providing a break in the street frontage. The setback should be at least 0.5 metres from the front of the building to give a break in the frontage of the properties

KEY ISSUES

4.6 Visual impact on the dwelling and the area, impact on the neighbouring property and highways issues.

VISUAL IMPACT ON THE DWELLING AND THE AREA

4.7 The proposed design represents a different approach to the more common hipped roof side extension and although a hipped roof side extension would be more preferable in visual terms, the swept roof is an approach the City Council has endorsed elsewhere. In terms of the previously approved application, the proposed design, including the swept roof and reduced first floor footprint, was considered to represent a solution which would overcome the particular problems arising from the siting and relationship between this property and its neighbour at Number 3. The square column detailing is a feature accepted elsewhere, especially around front porch extensions to this type of semi-detached property. The bulk of the wall would be broken up by a proposed string course and soldier course detail. Due to the location of the property the side extension would not impact upon the St Paul's Conservation Area.

4.8 The proposed extension is not set back from the front building line, however the proposed roof which is swept down from the original roof over the side extension gives a subservient appearance. The cut away sections to the front and side elevation break up the bulk of the extension and reinforce the appearance of subservience when viewed from the street.

4.9 The proposed revisions to this application would not adversely affect the appearance of the property within the street scene and the proposal is considered acceptable in this respect.

IMPACT ON THE NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

4.10 The nearest neighbours to the property are number 1 Enfield Crescent situated to the east and Number 3 Enfield Crescent located to the west of the subject property and it is the impact upon the neighbour at 3 Enfield Crescent which is considered to be most pertinent in this instance. It is not considered that 1 Enfield Crescent would be adversely affected by these proposals.

4.11 As outlined previously the siting and proximity of these properties is not typical and probably results from the steep gradient of Enfield Crescent. As a consequence Number 3 Enfield Crescent is situated on a large corner plot set over differing levels. The dwelling itself is set at a level some 2 metres higher than Number 2. Only a small part of the garden at Number 3 appears to be used, this area lies adjacent to the shared boundary and would be adjacent to the proposed side extension. This part of the garden, the main amenity space, is only 3.5 metres in depth.

4.12 The proposed side extension would be situated some 3.6 metres away from the rear of the property. Although it is recognised that the revised design with swept roof would lower the eaves of the side extension and that Number 3 is set at a higher level, the additional 1.5 metres of the two storey extension, proposed by the resubmission, would bring the extension level with the side of Number 3 and increase the sense of enclosure, by creating a tunnel effect. This would adversely affect the amenity of this neighbouring property.

4.13 It is not considered that loss of sunlight /overshadowing, nor loss of privacy would adversely affect the neighbouring property.

HIGHWAYS ISSUES

4.15 There would be space remaining on the driveway for parking a car and sufficient space for cycle parking. No objections are raised by Highways Network Management subject to condition HWAY 19 being applied.

5.0 CONCLUSION

51. The positioning of the subject property and its neighbour is unusual and makes a standard two storey side extension difficult to achieve in this particular location. The neighbouring property, Number 3 Enfield Crescent, has a very short rear garden/area of useable amenity space which is only 3.5 m in depth. Because of these factors the previously approved application with swept roof and reduced length of rear projection (at first floor level) was considered to create an achievable extension which would not impact adversely upon this neighbour. It was approved under delegated powers accordingly. However, this application proposes to reinstate the 1.5 metre section of two storey extension, bringing the massing and bulk of the building closer to the neighbour, creating a sense of enclosure and tunnel effect which is considered to be unacceptable.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 The scale and massing of the proposed two storey extension would bring the built development closer to the neighbour at Number 3, creating a tunnel effect and sense of enclosure which is considered to adversely affect the residential amenity of this neighbour. This would be contrary to Policies H7 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (2005); National Planning Policy Statement 1 'Planning and Sustainable Development' and Supplementary Planning Guidance contained in City of York 'A Guide to Extensions and Alterations of Private Dwelling Houses'.

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Contact details:

Author: Clare Davies Development Control Officer

Tel No: 01904 551493