

## COMMITTEE REPORT

**Date:** 8 September 2011      **Ward:** Fulford  
**Team:** Householder and **Parish:** Fulford Parish Council  
Small Scale Team

**Reference:** 11/02045/FUL  
**Application at:** 34 Eastward Avenue York YO10 4LZ  
**For:** Two storey rear extension with balcony, two storey extension to front incorporating porch, alterations to roof, with gates, brick piers, wall and railings to front (amended scheme to incorporate enlargement of front porch to include additional window)  
**By:** Mr Ahmed Karbani  
**Application Type:** Full Application  
**Target Date:** 22 September 2011  
**Recommendation:** Refuse

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application relates to an amendment to a previously approved scheme to carry out alterations and extensions to a semi-detached property. The property is of traditional design within a street of similar properties and has square projecting bay windows at both ground and first floor. In September 2010 planning permission was refused for a number of alterations and extensions to the property, including a two storey rear extension, a two storey extension to the front including a porch, alterations to the roof, with gates, brick piers, wall and railings to the front boundary. The reasons for refusal related to the visual impact of the proposed gates, walls and railings on the property and wider streetscene, and the effect of the two storey rear extension on the amenity of the adjacent occupiers. The visual impact of the proposed porch did not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal. A subsequent appeal to the Secretary of State was allowed (9 February 2011).

1.2 The porch that formed part of the approved scheme would have incorporated a maximum projection of 1.5 metres with a width of approximately 2.2 metres. The projection beyond the existing bay window would have been approximately 0.9 metres. It is now proposed to increase the forward projection of the porch by an additional 0.5 metres (this has been reduced by 0.2 metres in comparison to the original submission), giving a maximum projection of 2.0 metres, approximately 1.4 metres beyond the bay window. The additional length of porch would incorporate a flat roof, projecting beyond the pitch of the approved scheme. It is also proposed to carry out minor alterations to the approved door and window arrangements on the front elevation of the porch. The remaining elements of the application that were allowed on appeal are unchanged.

1.3 In support of the application, the applicant states that the enlargement of the porch is required in order to overcome drainage issues and also to allow mobility scooter to be stored in the porch area.

1.4 The application is brought to the East Area Sub-Committee for a decision as the previous application was also determined by the Committee.

## **2.0 POLICY CONTEXT**

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

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

Schools GMS Constraints: Fulford 0246

2.2 Policies:

CYH7  
Residential extensions

CYGP1  
Design

## **3.0 CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 Internal

None

3.2 External

Parish Council - Comments awaited

Highways - No objections

Police Architectural Liaison Officer - No objections

Neighbours - One letter received which expresses concern at the length of time the work has been ongoing, and the adverse visual effect of such structures on the street.

## 4.0 APPRAISAL

### 4.1 KEY ISSUES:

- visual impact on the appearance of the property and wider streetscene.

### POLICY CONTEXT:

4.2 Relevant Central Government planning policy is contained in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development. This encourages good design and social inclusion. Paragraph 34 of PPS1 states that design which is inappropriate in its context or fails to take the opportunity of improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted. It stresses the need of taking into account the needs of all the community, including particular requirements relating to age, sex, ethnic background, religion, disability and income.

4.3 Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Development Control Local Plan (incorporating fourth set of changes) and advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'A Guide to Extensions and Alterations to Private Dwelling Houses' March 2001 are material to the consideration of the application.

4.4 Policy GP1 sets out a series of criteria that the design of development proposals would be expected to meet. These include requirements to: respect or enhance the local environment; 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; and, ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures.

4.5 Policy H7 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.

4.6 In relation to porches, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance states that a porch extension should be of a simple design and of a size which does not dominate the front elevation. The shape and materials should reflect the character of the main building, including the style of doors and windows. A pitched roof to the porch should be used.

### VISUAL IMPACT

4.7 The site lies on the south side of a straight road that is characterised mainly by semi-detached houses. Whilst the design and external appearance of houses differ, there is a strong building line at the front and a regular rhythm and spacing of

properties along the street. There are examples of the addition of porches and canopies above the original front entrance doors, though these are of limited projection. It is considered that with a projection of 2.0 metres as proposed, the porch would appear incongruous and unduly dominant in a very regular building line. Given the lack of front porches within the street of a similar scale, it would also be uncharacteristic of the street in general. Furthermore, the limited depth of the front garden would only serve to increase the degree of prominence in the streetscene.

4.8 An earlier application for alterations and extensions to the property, which was refused in November 2008, included a porch with a similar projection to that now proposed, albeit with an entirely flat roof design. One of the reasons for refusal stated "The front porch, by virtue of its flat roof design and 2 metre forward projection would appear unduly prominent along this row of properties in Eastward Avenue". That decision was not challenged on appeal, although subsequent discussions with officers indicated that a maximum projection of 1.2 metres would perhaps be acceptable as a maximum amount. The subsequent decision to allow a projection of 1.5 metres, therefore, represented a compromise between that which was considered acceptable and the originally submitted 2.0 metre projection.

4.9 The reasons given by the applicant for wishing to increase the size of the porch are to overcome drainage difficulties (it is understood that the front wall of the porch as originally approved would be directly over the line of a drain) and in order to accommodate a mobility scooter. Whilst being sympathetic to the applicant's needs, it is considered that alternative solutions such as re-routing the drain, and perhaps accommodating the mobility scooter in an alternative location within the extended property, should be explored more thoroughly. Clearly, any harm to the streetscene is likely to be long term, and may set a precedent for similar proposals within the street, causing further cumulative harm. Given that the 2.0 metre projection now proposed formed part of an earlier reason for refusal, officers are maintaining a consistent approach in recommending refusal on this occasion, although clearly the circumstances of the applicant, both personal and from a practical point of view, need to be taken into account in reaching a decision.

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

5.1 Officers recommend refusal of the application due to the adverse impact of the enlarged front porch on the streetscene.

## **COMMITTEE TO VISIT**

## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse**

1 It is considered that the additional forward extension of the front porch would appear as an unduly prominent, incongruous and uncharacteristic addition which would be harmful to the appearance of the property and wider streetscene. Thus it is considered that the proposal would conflict with national planning advice in relation to design contained within Planning Policy Statement 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development", Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (Fourth Set of Changes - April 2005) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance " Guide to Alterations and Extensions to Private Dwelling Houses" (March 2001).

### **Contact details:**

**Author:** Simon Glazier Householder and Small Scale Team Leader

**Tel No:** 01904 551322