#### **COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Date:** 18 August 2011 **Ward:** Rural West York

**Team:** Householder and **Parish:** Askham Bryan Parish

Small Scale Team Council

Reference: 11/01622/FUL

**Application at:** 47 Askham Fields Lane Askham Bryan York YO23 3PS **For:** Two storey side and single storey front and rear

extensions

By: Mr Ian Thornton

**Application Type:** Full Application

**Target Date:** 19 August 2011 **Recommendation:** Approve

#### 1.0 PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and a detached garage at 47 Askham Fields Lane, York.
- 1.2 The application has been brought to committee at the request of Cllr Steward on the grounds that development is too big and projects too far forward.

#### 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Air safeguarding GMS Constraints: Air Field safeguarding 0175

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: West Area 0004

## 2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design

CYH7

Residential extensions

CYGB4

Extension to existing dwellings in GB

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS

## 3.1 External

Askham Bryan Parish Council - Object on the following grounds: Scale is inappropriate
Mass and scale not in keeping with the existing property
Building to the front inappropriate
Side extension should not be deeper than the lounge
Plans indicate stairs leading to the first floor
Should not be painted

Neighbours - Two letters from 42 and 49 Askham Fields Lane objecting on the following grounds:
Front extension is out of keeping
Should be matching bricks not painted

Kitchen wall built close to the boundary

Mass and scale not in keeping with the street

## 4.0 APPRAISAL

- 4.1 Key Issues
- Design
- Impact upon neighbours amenity

4.2 The relevant City of York Council Draft Deposit Local Plan Policies are H7, GP1 and GB4. 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 the area and spaces

between dwellings; and that there should be no adverse effect on the amenity that neighbouring residents could reasonably expect to enjoy.

- 4.3 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.
- 4.4 Policy GB4 'Extensions to Existing Dwellings' states that the extension and alteration of dwellings in the green belt and open countryside will be permitted providing the proposal: would not cause undue visual intrusion; is appropriate in terms of design and materials and is small scale compared to the original dwelling.

## **LOCATION**

4.5 The application site is a semi-detached house located along Askham Fields Lane. The site forms part of a short row of semi-detached properties located within the grounds of Askham Bryan Agricultural College. The properties differ in character and are not uniform in their design. The site is within a major development site (Askham Bryan College) as allocated in the draft local plan where limited infilling in connection with the educational use of the site is permitted providing the development has no greater impact on the purposes of including the land in the green belt than the existing development. This however refers to the educational use of the site as opposed to this extension to a residential house. Despite this allocation the site is still washed over green belt.

#### TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

4.6 The scheme seeks permission for various additions. A two storey side extension is proposed. This would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling by 200mm and dropped down in ridge. It would extend to the side by 4.6m and would have a depth of 10.2m, resulting in the extension projecting past the rear elevation of the host dwelling by 4.2m. The front

elevation would have simple window openings to match the existing. To the rear a balcony is proposed to the first floor.

4.7 It is considered that in terms of design this element is acceptable. Whilst the set back is less than usually allowed there would be no issues of terracing arising as the dwelling sits at the end of the road and has a substantial side garden bounded by mature conifer trees. Whilst the rearward projection is large it would not have any detrimental impact upon the adjoined neighbour due to its distance of 7.7m to the shared boundary. Furthermore, the site lies to the north of the adjoined neighbour and as such there would not be any loss of light. A privacy screen is proposed to the side elevation of the balcony to prevent views to the neighbouring garden.

## **REAR EXTENSION**

4.8 Also proposed is a single storey rear extension. This would project out by 5.7m and have a width of 5.5m. It would be constructed with a gable end with the roof pitching in from the boundary. The adjoined neighbour has a conservatory which runs along the shared boundary and has high level glazing facing onto the application site. The erection of the extension would result in the loss of light to these windows but as this is 'borrowed' light it would not constitute a reason for refusal. Furthermore, light can enter through 9th polycarbonate roof. The extension would finish in line with the rear elevation of the conservatory and as such would not be readily visible from inside the ground floor of the neighbouring property.

## FRONT EXTENSION

4.9 Also proposed to the front elevation are two bay windows and a porch which are connected by a continuous canopy. The bay windows would project out by 800mm and have a width of 2.1m with the porch projecting out by 1.3m. Whilst front extension are not usually encouraged these works do not appear to have any detrimental impact upon the streetscene. The adjoined neighbour has installed projecting bay windows and a canopy to the entrance way and whilst these do not extend to the ground or project out as far as the proposed they break up the uniformity of the front elevation and allow the proposed works to become more in keeping.

#### **GARAGE**

4.10 As part of the scheme a large detached garage is also proposed. This would be located to the north eastern corner of the site,

approximately 11m from the shared boundary. It would provide a double garage at ground floor, which would be accessed off the existing rear lane, and storage within the roof space. It would measure approximately 6.7m by 6.7m with an eaves of 3m and a ridge height of 5.6m. Whilst this is a large structure it would be located away from the neighbouring property and would back onto mature conifer trees and waste ground owned by the college. It lies to the north of the adjoined neighbour and as such has no impact in terms of loss of light or overdominance.

#### **GREEN BELT POLICY**

- 4.11 As stated the site lies within the green belt, although within the major development site of the college. Green belt policy states that extensions should be small scale and should not cause undue visual intrusion . A figure of 25% increase in footprint is suggested. The proposed extension to the dwelling calculates at 150% increase and when the garage is added approximately 230%. This is clearly contrary to policy. However, a number of the properties in the row have had previous large extensions.
- 4.12 The main ones relate to 38 Askham Fields Lane for a single storey side extension with an increase footprint of 90%, 46 Askham Fields Lane for a two storey side and rear extension with a 104% increased footprint, 49 Askham Fields Lane for a two storey rear, single storey side and conservatory to the rear with an increased footprint of 125% and 36 Askham Fields Lane with a two storey side extension calculating at 170% increase.
- 4.13 Due to the presence of these large scale extensions, such developments have become somewhat characteristic of this lane. Whilst the development proposed is clearly contrary to established green belt policy, in this particular instance officers consider that a precedent has been set here for allowing large scale extensions and, on balance, officers consider that as such it would now be more difficult to refuse this application on the grounds of inappropriate development in the green belt and the resultant harm to the openness of the green belt.

### 5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that although the extension is large it would not detract from the streetscene. The two storey element is subservient when viewed from the front and would not have any detrimental impact upon neighbours amenity or the character of the area. Whilst front extensions are not usually encouraged these are considered to be small scale and in

keeping with the works which have previously been carried out to the adjoined neighbour. The rear extension aligns with the neighbouring conservatory and lies to the north and as such would not have any detrimental impact in terms of loss of amenity. Whilst the garage is large it does not detract from the character of the area or result in a loss of amenity for the neighbours. The presence of other large scale extensions along this lane further mitigates what would otherwise be inappropriate development in the green belt. Officers recommend 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 and other submitted details:-

Drawing numbers TAFL/1/02 and TAFL/1/03 received 23rd June 2011 Drawing numbers TAFL/1/04A received 12th July 2011 Drawing numbers TAFL/1/05A, TAFL/1/06B and TAFL/1/08A received 4th August 2011

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

3 VISQ1 Matching materials

# 7.0 INFORMATIVES: Notes to Applicant

1. REASON FOR APPROVAL

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 to the streetscene, residential amenity or the openness of the green belt. As such the proposal complies with Policy YH9 and Y1C of The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, policies GP1, H7 and GB4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and Government policy contained within Planning Policy

Guidance note 2 'Green Belts'.

## **Contact details:**

Author: Heather Fairy (Mon - Wed) Development Management Officer

**Tel No:** 01904 551352

Application Reference Number: 11/01622/FUL Item No: 3e

Page 7 of 7