

## COMMITTEE REPORT

**Date:** 9 September 2010      **Ward:** Heslington  
**Team:** East Area      **Parish:** Heslington Parish Council

**Reference:** 10/01110/FUL  
**Application at:** The Lodge Heslington Lane Heslington York YO10 5DX  
**For:** Single storey extension to North West corner of building  
**By:** Colourscape Investments  
**Application Type:** Full Application  
**Target Date:** 22 July 2010  
**Recommendation:** Approve

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This is an application is for a single storey wrap around extension, on the north west corner of The Lodge, Heslington Lane, Heslington. The proposal seeks to create additional residential accommodation in the form of four bedrooms and a lounge.

1.2 The Lodge is a substantial house dating from the early C19th. It has a later C19th side extension to the east and an extensive single storey wing was added to the rear in the late C20th to enable the building to function as a care home rather than a house. The building is listed at grade II, and it is situated in the Heslington conservation area.

1.3 Size. Projects approx 4.0m to side, and approx 4.8m to rear. Width approx 12.1m along the side, and approx 11.6m along the rear. Height - Side element approx 2.3m to eaves, and approx 3.8m to ridge. Rear element approx 2.3m to eaves, and approx 4.5m to ridge.

1.4 The application has been called in to Committee by Councillor Aspden, due to the concerns of the Parish Council, who wish to have the opportunity to speak on the application

1.5 A separate application for listed building consent has been submitted, which is also considered on this agenda.

### 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Conservation Area GMS Constraints: Heslington CONF

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

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

## Listed Buildings GMS Constraints: Grade 2; The Lodge Heslington Lane

### 2.2 Policies:

CYGP1  
Design

CYHE3  
Conservation Areas

CYHE4  
Listed Buildings

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS

### INTERNAL

3.1 Conservation Officer - Two responses received dated 27.07.10 and 25.08.10 respectively. Both expressed concerns about inaccuracies in the submitted plans, and subsequent revisions. The Conservation Officer's view was that 'the drawings are not sufficiently accurate to allow the effect on the listed building to be judged'

Highway Management - No objections 21.06.10.

### EXTERNAL

3.2 Heslington Parish Council - 18.08.10. - Object on the following grounds; considerable increase in the size of the footprint; loss of amenity to neighbours; front visual aspect detrimental to character and form of the village.

3.3 Neighbour Response - Letters received from Walnut House, Walnut Close (2 letters), and The Garden House, Spring Lane. Concerns raised relate to:

- loss of natural light,
- proximity to boundary and existing windows,
- overshadowing,
- loss of privacy,
- increase in noise levels. Staff and residents are already noisy late at night and early mornings when residents are being attended to. Staff taking breaks, washing machines/tumble driers are already a source of noise,
- a similar proposal has been refused in the past,
- insufficient room for maintenance,
- removal of trees in order to accommodate the new building

## 4.0 APPRAISAL

### 4.1 KEY ISSUES

Impact on the Listed Building  
Impact on the Conservation Area.  
Impact on neighbours

The relevant policies and guidance:

4.2 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICY CYGP1 - design sets out a series of criteria that the design of development proposals would be expected to meet. These 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.

4.3 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICY HE3 states; planning permission, within conservation areas proposals for external alterations will only be permitted where there is no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

4.4 Policy HE4 of the City of York Draft Local Plan says that listed building consent will only be granted for internal or external alterations where there is no adverse effect on the character, appearance or setting of the building.

4.5 Impact of the proposed extension on the conservation area: when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities have a duty to consider the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area (Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990)

4.6 PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 5. The relevant Central Government planning policy is contained in Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment. PPS5 sets out the planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment. It requires local planning authorities to take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

#### 4.7 ASSESSMENT.

The proposal seeks to create additional residential accommodation by extending beyond existing extensions approved under Selby District Council in the latter part of the last century. The listing relates to features incorporated into the original house, built in the early 19th century. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are some discrepancies in the submitted drawings, these are not considered to be so significant that they prevent the application being determined. Following a meeting with the conservation officer on 26.08.2010, it was concluded that there were no

objections in principle to the scheme. It is anticipated that more accurate plans will be submitted by the applicant prior to the application being heard at committee, and the comments of the Conservation Officer can be updated accordingly.

4.8 CONSERVATION AREA. The proposed extension will be set back approx 37.0m from Main Street. It is modest in scale, and incorporates a hipped roof. Bricks and tiles will match existing. As with previous extensions, when the house was converted into a residential care home, this proposal maintains the separation of the two historic uses, rather than attempting to match the original house. As such, it is not considered to impact adversely on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

4.9 Parish Council's Comments - The footprint of the building is significantly increased, however The Lodge occupies a very spacious plot. The set back of approx 37.0m from Main Street would significantly reduce the visual impact of the proposal, and only the relatively narrow frontage of the extension would be visible, thus its full extent would not be apparent from the public domain. As stated above, the differentiation of the two historic uses of The Lodge is well established. Given the modest scale of the proposal, and significant set back, it would not be considered to be detrimental to the character and form of the village.

4.10 IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY. The side element of the proposed extension is approx 2.3m to eaves and approx 3.5m to ridge. The rear element is approx 2.3m to eaves and approx 4.2m to ridge. In terms of Garden House to the rear, the shared boundary is screened by a very high hedge, and the actual property is set a further approx 7.0m back. In terms of Walnut House to the side, this property is less well screened, and lies closer to the shared boundary. There is only one window indicated on the facing elevation. This is incorporated into one of the new bedrooms, and will be set back approx 3.0m from the shared boundary wall. In each case it is not considered there are any serious issues in terms of loss of privacy, overshadowing, or over dominance. The only communal room incorporated into the scheme, is that of the lounge. This will be set back approx 4.0m from the shared boundary of Walnut House. There are no windows indicated on the facing elevation. Again it is not considered there are any serious issues in terms of noise or disturbance.

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

5.1 The proposal is not considered to impact unduly on residential amenity or on the character or appearance of the conservation area, and is thus recommended for approval.

## **COMMITTEE TO VISIT**

**6.0 RECOMMENDATION:** Approve

1 TIME2 Development start within three years

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:-

Revised Plan 712.002 Revision B - Received 4th August 2010.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

3 VISQ8 Samples of exterior materials to be app

## **7.0 INFORMATIVES:**

### **Notes to Applicant**

1. 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 effect on residential amenity and the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such, the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and HE3 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan- Incorporating the 4th Set of Changes (2005); and national planning advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 5 " Planning for the Historic Environment"

### **Contact details:**

**Author:** Paul Edwards Development Management Assistant

**Tel No:** 01904 551642