

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: East Area
Date: 11 March 2010

Ward: Fulford
Parish: Fulford Parish Council

Reference: 09/01324/FUL
Application at: 52 School Lane Fulford York YO10 4LS
For: Two storey pitched roof extension to rear
By: Mr J Walker
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 29 September 2009
Recommendation: Refuse

1.0 PROPOSAL

Proposed Development

1.1 The application property is a small bungalow fronting onto School Lane. The building is located within what was originally the rear garden of 65 Main Street.

1.2 It is proposed to erect a two-storey extension to the rear of the property. This would increase the internal floor area of the property by approximately 66% and result in the bungalow becoming a two bedroomed part two storey, part single storey dwelling.

1.3 Several amendments have been submitted since the application was originally submitted in August 2009.

Application site

1.4 The property would front School Lane. It is located within the Fulford Conservation area. One of the main historic characteristics is the existence of "burgage" plots to the rear of the properties on Main Street. On the opposite side of School Lane is a playing field. The area is predominantly residential in character with School Lane containing a mix of house styles.

Planning History

1.5 Planning permission for the erection of the bungalow was granted in August 1983 (8/1/181). The application description was "Proposed erection of building for use as granny flat and erection of detached garage at 65 Main Street, Fulford". No occupancy conditions were put in place in respect to its relationship to the host property. In this context it is considered to be acceptable for the bungalow to be occupied as an independent unit

1.6 In 2004 (04/02273) outline planning permission was granted for the erection of a two-bedroom bungalow on the adjoining section of rear garden (67 Main Street). This has not been constructed; planning permission expired in December 2009. The

approved plans show a bungalow with no openings facing to the north. It would have been located a little further back from School Lane than the property subject to this application.

1.7 The application is being brought to committee at the request of a local Member given the concerns raised by neighbours and its location within a conservation area.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Conservation Area GMS Constraints: Fulford 0041

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

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

2.2 Policies:

CYH7
Residential extensions

CYGP1
Design

CYHE2
Development in historic locations

CYHE3
Conservation Areas

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Internal

Highway Network Management - Although the manoeuvring area is unduly tight this does not raise highway concerns. Cycle storage facilities should be provided.

Conservation Officer - Whilst emphasis should be placed on the preservation of burgage plots, particularly where they remain intact, in this instance, the site has already been developed to some extent with a small dwelling and car port, the latter truncating views through the site. By virtue of its height, the two-storey extension will be more prominent in the street scene, but due to its scale, orientation and narrow width, will allow views over the plot to historic frontage development on Main Street.

I am concerned that the position, and width of the car port in relation to the width of the plot, effectively truncates the burgage plot; in this respect, the proposal fails to preserve the character of the conservation area. Replacement of hedges with timber fences lends a suburban appearance to the site, further eroding the contribution it makes to the character of the conservation area.

Landscape Architect - No objections.

Archaeology - Watching brief required on all groundworks.

3.2 External

Parish Council

Object: The development would lead to the loss of one of the few remaining burgage plots facing School Lane. Such plots are crucial to the area's character and history.

The extension is not subservient, the design is unsympathetic, the blank side elevation unduly dominant and vegetation will be lost.

External amenity space is inadequate.

The extension would cast shadow on to the garden of 50 School Lane and side windows would overlook the house.

65 Main Street will lose much of its off-street car parking and will have access difficulties. This is of particular concern given congestion on Main Street.

Neighbours

Objections were received from the occupants of 3 properties and a local Member. The issues raised were:

It could harm development potential of 67 Main Street.

It overhangs the garden of 67 Main Street and the access path is on the garden of 63 Main Street.

It is contrary to the council's guidance on house extensions as it overdevelops the site, is not subservient to the existing house, the design is alien and there is little garden space.

It harms the conservation area and burgage plot.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The key issues in assessing the proposal are:

Impact on neighbours living conditions

Impact on the streetscene and conservation area.
Quality of living accommodation created.

4.2 Policy H7 (Residential extensions) and GP1 (Design) of the Draft Local Plan set out design and amenity criteria when assessing proposals for extensions. The site is within Fulford Conservation Area. When determining planning applications within such areas, the Council has a statutory duty to consider the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area. This is reflected in national planning advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (Planning and the Historic Environment). Policy HE2 (Development in Historic Locations) and HE3 (Conservation Areas) of the Draft Local Plan state that developments must respect the form of the local area and not have an adverse impact on its character and appearance.

4.4 The key issues in assessing the application are:

Impact on neighbours living conditions

4.5 It is considered that there is adequate separation to the rear with a distance of approximately 35-40 metres to the rear of houses on Main Street. Immediately to the south is the narrow rear garden of 67 Main Street. The length of the garden of 67 Main Street is such that the overall living conditions would not be unduly affected.

4.6 The 2004 planning permission for the bungalow on land at the rear of 67 Main Street facing School Lane has now lapsed. Without prejudice to any application that might be submitted in the future, it is not considered that the design of the extension is such that it would necessarily compromise residential development on the adjoining site (no windows are proposed facing this site).

4.7 Number 50 School Lane is to the north. It has windows on the side elevation facing the extension, however, these are either non-habitable or secondary (the house was visited internally). Although there will be some loss of light/sunlight to the house and garden, the overall living conditions will still be maintained. Any overlooking from the extension landing window could be avoided by the use of obscure glazing.

4.8 There is a private path between number 50 and the extension. This serves as a pedestrian access to several properties that front Main Street. It is not considered, given the limited usage of this route and the space retained to the side of the extension, that the change in its character would justify the refusal of planning permission.

4.9 Number 52 School Lane is to the south. The only side opening is a secondary window to the living room. As such, it is not considered that the overall impact on living conditions is unacceptable.

4.10 Some neighbours have raised concerns in respect to overlooking from the rear first floor opening of the extension. However, the level of overlooking from the proposed extension would be broadly the same as that which can be viewed from surrounding properties. It is noted that the rear opening at the first floor is relatively

large, however, the overall opportunity for overlooking would not be significantly different than that from other properties.

Impact on the streetscene and conservation area

4.11 The proposed extension would be relatively distinctive in style given its narrowness, the single storey element to the front and the 'barn-like' form. It is not considered, however, that it would detract from the appearance of the conservation area. This section of School Lane contains a mix of house sizes and roof forms and in this context it is considered that the development would contribute to the local character. The position of the two-storey element relative to the road is broadly in line with adjoining properties and the height is substantially lower. The narrow width of the development will ensure that a significant gap will remain between the side of the proposed extension and the side of number 50 School Lane. This will emphasise the linear nature of the burgage plots and retain views through to the rear of Main Street. The relatively low height of the two-storey element and its limited fenestration also suggests that it is a secondary building within the original long rear plot fronting Main Street. It is accepted that there is a degree of conflict with guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on residential extensions. However, this is generalised guidance that will not always be applicable to unconventional or historic settings.

4.12 A car port was proposed to the rear of the extension, however, following concerns from the Council's conservation officer in respect to its width and the preference for a natural landscaped boundary, the applicant has agreed that this can be deleted.

Quality of accommodation created.

4.13 The proposed extension would create a reasonably proportioned two-bedroom house from the existing small one-bedroom chalet bungalow. It is considered that the level of internal space and light levels are acceptable.

4.14 As part of the scheme one parking space for 65 Main Street and one space for the application property is proposed to the rear of the extension. Access to this space will run alongside the proposed accommodation and its small garden. It is not ideal to bring a vehicle past the side of a property in this way, however, a vehicle access to 65 Main Street already exists and goes past the small bungalow. The extension has been designed with no main habitable room windows facing the access and as such it is not considered that vehicles passing so close to the property would constitute a reason for refusal.

4.15 The existing small size of the property is such that it would normally be occupied by one person. The historic arrangement between 65 Main Street and 52 School Lane has appeared to be fairly informal with a relative of the occupant of the main house living in the bungalow. The proposed works will increase the size of the accommodation by approximately two thirds. The proposed works make it much more likely that occupancy levels will increase and the property will no longer be occupied as a 'granny flat'.

4.16 Despite the proposed increase in size of the house the garden space is limited. There is no space for cycle parking and manoeuvring for vehicles is also tight. It is considered that this is unsatisfactory for creating satisfactory living conditions and has the potential to create future conflict between the occupants of both properties.

4.17 The planning permission that was granted for a bungalow on the adjacent plot incorporated all car parking to the front of the house with the garden to the rear. A pedestrian route to 67 Main Street ran along the side of the property.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that the proposed design would not appear out of context in a varied streetscene and the narrow width of the development would help to retain the linear character of the existing burgage plot. However, the proposed external amenity space and parking area at the rear of the property is extremely cramped and considered inadequate to serve the enlarged property.

5.2 It is recommended therefore that the application be refused.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 The proposed extension would result in a significant increase in the size of the existing dwelling, however, the external amenity space to serve the extended property is extremely limited and contains no provision for cycle storage. In addition, the shared space for vehicle manoeuvring is unduly tight. It is considered that this would create a poor living environment for the occupiers 52 School Lane and have the potential to cause conflict with the occupants of 65 Main Street. It is considered, therefore, that the proposed extension conflicts with policy GP1 (criterion g) and H7 (criterion g) and appendix E of the City of York Draft Local Plan (fourth set of changes) approved April 2005 and advice contained within paragraph 1.23 of the City of York Council's Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwellings March 2001.

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Contact details:

Author: Neil Massey Development Control Officer (Wed/Thurs/Fri)

Tel No: 01904 551657