

Protection from flooding

CYGP4A
Sustainability

CYH4A
Housing Windfalls

CYHE3
Conservation Areas

CYL1C
Provision of New Open Space in Development

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

HIGHWAY NETWORK MANAGEMENT

3.1 No objections. If planning permission granted would like conditions relating to surfacing and layout of vehicle areas, and internal turning areas to be provided.

DESIGN, CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

3.2 The proposed detached single storey dwelling house will intensify the density of development to the rear of Bentham Lodge and is situated within close proximity of two storey dwellings houses at nos. 1 and 3 Slingsby Grove to the north and adjacent to the existing single storey dwelling house at no. 94a Tadcaster Road. The submitted plans do not illustrate the relative height of the proposed bungalow to the existing buildings within the context of the site. The site is partially visible from Tadcaster Road and is situated outwith the conservation area boundary. The proposed dwelling house is unlikely to have a negative effect on the setting, character, or appearance of the conservation area.

STRUCTURES AND DRAINAGE

3.3 Object. Insufficient information has been provided by the developer to determine the potential impact the proposal may have on existing drainage systems

LIFELONG LEARNING AND LEISURE

3.4 As there is no on site open space off site contributions are required for (a) Amenity open space - which would be used to improve a local site within the local area e.g. Knavesmire or Hob Moor (b) Play space - which would be used to improve a local site within the local area e.g. or Nelsons Lane (c) Sports pitches - would be used to improve a facility within the West Zone of the Sport and Active Leisure Strategy. The contribution to off site provision is to be based on the latest York formula through a Section 106 Agreement.

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

DRINGHOUSES/WOODTHORPE PLANNING PANEL

3.5 No objections but comments made which should be subject of conditions:

- Access to the other properties situated to the west if the site must be available at all times for foot and vehicle access including fire and ambulance during construction. No building materials must be stored on the road
- The appearance of the site would be enhanced by shrubbery bordering the road, this in due course would compensate for e.g. felling in recent years of mature trees which ensured privacy for the neighbouring dwellings

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION/PUBLICITY

3.6 Four letters of objection received making the following points:

- Proposals for a further bungalow would severely overcrowd an already congested site
- Design and Access statement is misleading said former garden had not been used and was overgrown for some time
- Concerned regarding the potential disruption during construction
- The plan of the proposed development is not a true reflection of the site. The garage and the wooden structure of No 92 are not shown
- Loss of outlook and light and cause a sense of enclosure to dwellings on Slingsby Grove
- Concerned regarding the number of parking spaces, and the potential for increased parking on Slingsby Grove
- Concerned that dormer windows may be added at a later date
- Further building would overcrowd and congested site, suffering existing disturbance from the guest house at No. 92 are concerned disturbance would further erode quality of life
- An additional dwelling would increase the wear and tear of the access road and would result in parking on the access road
- Concerned that further extensions would result in a loss of privacy

4.0 APPRAISAL

KEY ISSUES

1. Impact of the dwelling on the character of the area
2. Impact on neighbouring property
3. Impact on highway safety
4. Drainage

PLANNING POLICY

4.1 PPS3 supports PPS1 with regards high quality new housing and encourages sustainable and environmentally friendly new housing development through the reuse of previously developed land, more efficient use of land through appropriate densities, reducing dependency on the private car and provision of affordable housing. It states that careful attention to design is particularly important where the chosen local strategy involves intensification of the existing urban fabric. More intensive development is not always appropriate. However, it also states that the density of an existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing styles and form. When well designed and built in the right location, new housing development can enhance the character and quality of an area.

4.2 The relevant development plan is The City of York Council Draft Deposit Local Plan, which was placed on Deposit in 1998. Reflecting points made, two later sets of pre inquiry

changes (PICs) were published in 1999. The Public Local Inquiry started in 1999 but was suspended by the Inspector for further work to be done on the Green Belt. A Third Set of Changes addressing this further work was placed on deposit in 2003. Subsequently a fourth set of changes have been drafted and approved by Full Council on 12th April 2005 for the purpose of making Development Control Decisions, on the advice of the Government Office.

IMPACT OF THE DWELLING ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA

4.3 The proposed dwelling is of a simple design that is if a similar style to the other two bungalows to the west of the site, which have been previous tandem development of the former garden of No. 92.

4.4 Policy GP10 ' Subdivision of Gardens and Infill Development' states that permission will only be granted for the development or subdivision of gardens areas where it would not be detrimental to the character and amenity of the local environment. Policy H4a 'Housing Windfalls' states that permission will be granted for new housing development on land within the urban area providing it is of an appropriate scale and density to surrounding development. Policy GP1 states that development should respect or enhance the local environment; be of a density, layout, scale, mass that is compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and protects private amenity space.

4.5 The proposal is not considered to accord with these policies. The site is significantly smaller than the other tandem development sites to the west of the site, and also those to the rear of Nos. 96, 98, and 100 Tadcaster Road. The existing tandem developments in the surrounding area are relatively large detached dwellings (in terms of footprint) set within large plots maintaining the spacious and open character of the area. The proposed dwelling would be set within a significantly smaller plot and whilst a smaller dwelling in comparison to the surroundings it is considered that it would appear cramped, by virtue of the small size of the plot but also the relatively small garden area around it providing little set back from the boundaries. The truncation of the garden of no.92 results in that existing large dwelling appearing out of proportion with its setting and plot size. The proposal would result in an appearance of overdevelopment. The proposed dwelling would only be partially visible from Tadcaster Road however it is considered that the intensification of the use of land and pattern of development would cause harm and also set a precedent in the area for future intensification of development and ultimately a change in the character of the area.

4.6 The dwelling would be a two bedroomed property. In addition to creating a cramped development the proposal would provide a dwelling with little usable private space and reduce the amenity space to no.92 Tadcaster Road, contrary to the prevailing character of development in the area.

4.7 The site is just outside the Tadcaster Road Conservation Area, the Conservation Officer does not consider the proposed dwelling would impact on the character of the conservation area.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY

4.8 The proposed bungalow by virtue of the hipped roof, height adjacent to the boundary, and the neighbouring dwellings (Nos 92, 92a and 96 Tadcaster Road) being set back from the shared boundary is not considered to cause a loss of light or overshadowing to these properties. The proposed dwelling is not considered to resulting in a loss of light to the dwellings to the rear on Slingsby Avenue by virtue of the distance between the dwellings and the relatively low height of the dwelling and the boundary treatment - a 2 metre high wall. The 2 metre high wall provides screening of the proposed development. The distance between the dwelling and the boundary wall is 2.5 metres and the approximate distance

between the proposed dwelling and the two storey dwellings to the rear on Slingsby Grove is approx 7 metres. The proposed dwelling is a modest height - 4.95 metres, together with hipped roof sloping away from the boundary, and in addition to the 2 metre high brick wall the dwelling is not considered to be overbearing or result in a sense of enclosure to these properties.

4.9 There have been objections from neighbours to the loss of outlook, however as the outlook from the primary rooms on Slingsby Grove are restricted by the 2 metre high wall the potential for loss of outlook is considered to be minimal and not sufficient to warrant refusal on these grounds.

4.10 By virtue of the boundary treatment it is not considered there would be overlooking or a loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwellings. If it is considered that the application should be approved it is recommended that permitted development rights be removed for windows and dormer windows in the roof to protect the amenity of the neighbouring occupants.

4.11 There has been some concerns regarding the potential disruption during construction, this is not a planning consideration.

IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

4.12 Some neighbour concerns had been received regarding the increase of parking that the proposed dwelling would create. The proposed dwelling would include an integral garage in addition to a turning area providing at least two parking spaces, as such Highways Network Management have not objected to the proposal

DRAINAGE

4.13 The Structures and Drainage team have objected to the proposal on the grounds of insufficient information. Sufficient information has not been provided and therefore the Structures and Drainage team are unable to determine the potential impact the proposal may have on the existing drainage systems.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 For the above reasons the proposed dwelling is considered to create a cramped overdeveloped development and would appear shoehorned into the site and thus would cause harm to the character of the area and has the potential to lead to further intensification and change in the pattern of development in the area. Refusal is recommended.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 It is considered that the proposed dwelling would appear 'shoe-horned' into an unsuitably small site. It is considered that this would result in a development that would appear cramped and out of character with the local form of development. As such, the proposal conflicts with Central Government advice in Planning Policy Statement 1: "Delivering Sustainable Development" and Planning Policy Statement 3: "Housing" and Policies GP1, GP10 and H4a of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005).

2 Insufficient drainage details have been submitted to show how foul and surface water generated by the proposal would be properly attenuated and how flood risk from all sources to the development itself and to others will be managed. The application therefore conflicts with Policy GP15a of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan; the Council's adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment; and Central Government policy contained within Planning Policy Statement 25 "Development and Flood Risk".

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Contact details:

Author: Victoria Bell Development Control Officer

Tel No: 01904 551347