

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: East Area
Date: 10 December 2009
Ward: Heworth
Parish: Heworth Planning Panel

Reference: 09/02022/FUL
Application at: 4 Stockton Lane York YO31 1BQ
For: Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and dormer to rear (revised retrospective application)
By: Mr Gary Fort
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 4 January 2010

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application is retrospective and relates to a semi-detached dwelling on Stockton Lane, close to the Heworth Green roundabout. In May 2008 planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a rear dormer (ref: 08/00519/FUL). The side extension and dormer have not been constructed in accordance with the originally approved drawings and thus a retrospective application for planning permission has been submitted. The key differences are that the two storey side extension has been erected with a minimal set back from the front wall of the property and is not set down from the ridge, and the rear dormer has been clad in uPVC rather than lead as originally approved.

1.2 This application has been referred to the East Area Planning sub - Committee at the request of Councillor Brian Watson on the basis that the application is retrospective and should be closely scrutinised by the Committee.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

2.2

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: East Area (1) 0003

Schools GMS Constraints: Heworth CE Primary 0201

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1

Design

CYH7

Residential extensions

CYHE2

Development in historic locations

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Internal

Environment And Conservation Officer - as the property, and in particular the rear dormer, is visible from Heworth Conservation Area, the conservation team have been consulted and comments are awaited.

3.2 External

Heworth Planning Panel - comments awaited

Response to neighbour consultation letters - consulted on 13 November, no replies received at the time of drafting this report

4.0 APPRAISAL

Key issue(s)

Impact on amenity of neighbours
Impact on streetscene:

The relevant polices and guidance:

4.2 PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 1 sets out the Government's overarching planning policies. It sets out the importance of good design in making places better for people and emphasises that development that is inappropriate in context or fails to take the opportunities available for improving an area should not be accepted.

4.3 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICY H7 - "Residential extensions" 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.

4.4 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICY GP1 - "Design" sets out a series of criteria that the design of development proposals would be expected to meet. Theses include requirements 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.

4.5 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICY HE2 states that within or adjoining conservation areas, development proposals must respect adjacent buildings, open spaces, landmarks and settings and have regard to local scale, proportion, detail and materials.

4.5 Supplementary Planning Guidance 'A Guide to Extensions and Alterations to Private Dwelling Houses' March 2001 states that two storey side extensions should be set down from the original roof line and set back behind the building line

Two storey side extension

4.6 The side extension has been erected with only a minimal set back and is not set down from the host ridge, and as such is not in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on residential extensions. The key objective of this requirement is to minimise the possible "terracing" effect, which can result from two adjacent semi-detached properties erecting side extensions without any set back or set down. However, in this particular case the adjacent property (2 Stockton Lane) is set at an angle to the application site, at a point where Stockton Lane turns the corner into Heworth Road. Whilst the extension as built creates a somewhat unbalanced appearance to the pair of semi-detached properties, it does not create a terracing effect and is unlikely to do so in the future due to the orientation of the adjacent dwelling. Thus, on balance, it is considered that the visual appearance of the two storey side extension as built is acceptable.

Rear Dormer Window

4.7 The originally approved drawings indicated that the rear dormer was to be clad in lead, which would create a relatively discreet appearance when viewed against the weathered red Rosemary tiles of the existing roof. In addition, condition 2 of the planning permission stipulated that the materials to be used externally for the development should match those of the existing buildings in colour, size, shape and texture. Indeed, had matching or similar materials been used for the external cladding (i.e. tile hanging), the dormer would constitute "permitted development" and would not require planning permission.

4.8 However, the dormer as built has been clad in white uPVC, which creates a stark contrast with the existing roof material. Whilst being at the rear of the property, the dormer is visible between properties on Heworth Road, which form the boundary of the Heworth/Heworth Green conservation area. Although the dormer appears to have been erected to the correct dimensions, due to the nature of the external cladding, it is considered that it presents a stark and dominating appearance which contrasts discordantly with the adjoining tile roofs. Furthermore, it is the case that uPVC will retain such an appearance for many years rather than mellowing or weathering with age as would more natural materials.

4.9 It is considered, therefore, that the external appearance of the dormer is unacceptable and would conflict with Policies GP1 and H7 of the Draft Local Plan, in addition to guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to residential extensions. National planning advice contained

within Planning Policy Statement 1 emphasises the importance of good design and states that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions, should not be accepted. It is considered that dormer as built would conflict with this advice. In February 2006, The Council successfully defended an appeal in relation to a dormer erected in similar circumstances on the rear elevation of a terraced property at 15 St. Clements Grove, off Bishopthorpe Road (Ref: APP/C2741/A/05/1193368).

Impact on Amenity of Neighbours

4.10 It is not considered that the variation in the design and external appearance of the two storey side extension and dormer has resulted in any additional impact on adjacent properties in terms of amenity and living conditions in comparison to the originally approved drawings, as the footprint, scale and massing are not significantly different.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on residential extensions advises that side extensions should be stepped back from the front elevation and set down from the main roof in order to avoid a terracing effect on the street scene. However, in this case the extension will not have a terracing effect given the angle between the applicant's dwelling and the next two storey dwelling.

5.2 It is considered that the retention of the pitched roof dormer window would result in an unacceptable addition to the dwelling by virtue of the white uPVC cladding, which creates a stark and unacceptable contrast with the existing and adjacent tiled roof coverings.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 It is considered that the rear dormer, due to the use of white uPVC for the external cladding, presents a stark and dominating appearance which contrasts discordantly with the adjoining tile roofs, and as such is considered to be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus the development is in conflict with Policies GP1, H7 and HE2 of the City of York Draft Local Plan and national planning advice relating to design contained within Planning Policy Statement 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development"

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Contact details:

Author: Sharon Jackson Development Control Assistant

Tel No: 01904 551359.