

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: East Area
Date: 17 May 2007

Ward: Huntington/New Earswick
Parish: Huntington Parish Council

Reference: 07/00415/FUL
Application at: 78 The Old Village Huntington York YO32 9RB
For: Two storey side and rear extensions and single storey garage to side and rear extension (Revised scheme 06/01300/FUL)
By: Mr B Corrie
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 19 April 2007

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application property is a detached two-storey property.

1.2 The rear garden and the western most edge of the garden is located within the Huntington Conservation Area.

1.3 It is proposed to erect a part two-storey and part one-storey side extension adjacent to 76 The Old Village and a two-storey rear extension to the rear and a garage adjacent to 78a.

1.4 The application is being brought to Committee at the request of a local member.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Conservation Area Huntington 0025

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams East Area (2) 0005

2.2 Policies:

CYH7
Residential extensions

CYGP1
Design

CYHE3
Conservation Areas

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Internal

Highway Network Management - No objections subject to existing vehicle access being removed to avoid over-provision of car parking.

Conservation - No objections subject to control of materials.

3.2 External

Parish Council - Object - The development is over dominance of the host property and incongruous in the street scene.

Neighbours

78a The Old Village - Object - Overdevelopment, the property is poorly maintained, harm to the birch tree, the proposed garage will detract from living conditions, proposed dual access will create conflicts with pedestrians, the new access in a more dangerous location, there is inadequate parking provided for the large property, harm to living conditions of number 76.

76 The Old Village - Object - Still feel the extension is too dominating, concerned about fumes from cars parking in the small parking space to the side, over-development.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The current application is a re-submission following the delegated refusal of an application for a side extension (06/01300). In 2004 (04/03458) planning permission was refused for two houses on the site following the demolition of the existing house. The most significant difference between this application and 06/01300 is that the depth of the two-storey element of the side-extension adjacent to number 76 is 4.2 metres rather than the whole 6.5 metre depth of the property. The other changes include the introduction of a garage and small single storey rear extension.

4.2 The applicant appealed against the City Council's refusal of planning application 06/01300. The Inspectorate dismissed the appeal. He gave two reasons for dismissing the appeal:

A. It would have an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of any occupants of 76 The Village.

B. Because of the extension's proximity to the birch tree it would detract from the appearance of the tree and the space around it which currently make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

4.3 In assessing the current scheme it is considered appropriate to assess whether these two issues of concern have been addressed. In addition the additional development added to this scheme need to be considered:

Additional Developments

4.4 The garage and rear two-storey extension is close to the side elevation of 78a The Village. The side elevation of 78a is blank with the exception of the side glazing on the rear extension. There is glazing in the rear and opposite elevation of this extension and it is therefore not considered that the development will cause unacceptable harm in respect to light and outlook.

4.5 The single storey rear extension is short in length (2.5 metres) and well away from the boundaries of the garden of the application property.

Highways

4.6 Two uncovered car parking spaces are proposed along with a garage capable of accommodating a car (this is located behind one of the spaces). If approved the house would be a large 4-bedroom property. Highway Network Management have raised concerns in respect to the over provision of car parking spaces. Although the desire to reduce car use is acknowledged it is considered that only two off-street are likely to be practical for parking and this would not be excessive taking account of the size and location of the property and the previous availability of off-street parking provision (a double garage with an undersized space to the front).

Impact on streetscene

4.7 It is considered that the design of the extension is sensitive to the main house. The design of the extension reflects the main house in scale, design and rhythm. In the context it is seen as an appropriate solution, even though the Council's guidance on house extensions typically seeks a set back.

4.8 The garage is set back an adequate distance to avoid it being prominent in the streetscene.

Impact on birch tree.

4.9 A significant birch tree is located within the rear garden of 74 The Village close to the application site. A trench for the existing foundations has already been dug. It is stated by the applicant that this is permitted development because if the scheme was refused a single storey extension could be erected in its place. The key issue is the relationship of the extension to the canopy. The merits of the scheme are fairly well balanced, however, it is considered that the reduction in the height of the element of the rear extension closest to the tree is sufficient to avoid the extension conflicting with the canopy and retains a reasonable amount of space around it.

Impact on number 76

4.10 It is considered that the current scheme is now of a scale that it would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions within the bungalow and small yard. The reduction in the extent of the two-storey element will mean that the outlook from the yard and house will be more open and more natural light and sunlight will reach the property throughout the year. The birch tree does combine to reduce light further, however, it is not considered that the overall impact is now so harmful to justify a refusal of permission.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 For the reasons given it is recommended that the application be approved.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

- 1 TIME2
- 2 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no windows or doors shall be inserted within the side or rear elevations of the approved house other than those shown on the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of occupants of the adjacent residential properties.

- 3 Notwithstanding the approved details, the proposed front elevation windows shall be 2 or 4 pane sliding sash.

Reason: To reflect the age of the original property.

- 4 A sample panel of the brickwork and roofing material to be used on this building shall be erected on the site and shall illustrate the colour, texture and bonding of brickwork and the mortar treatment to be used, and shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of building works. This panel shall be retained until a minimum of 2 square metres of wall of the approved development has been completed in accordance with the approved sample.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the finished appearance of these details prior to the commencement of building works in view of their sensitive location.

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Notes to Applicant

1. INFORMATIVE:

You are advised that prior to starting on site consent will be required from the Highway Authority for the works being proposed, under the Highways Act 1980 (unless alternatively specified under the legislation or Regulations listed below). For further information please contact the officer named:

Works in the highway - Section 171/Vehicle Crossing - Section 184 - Stuart Partington (01904) 551361

2. 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 impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the living conditions of neighbouring properties. As such the proposal complies with Policy GP1, H7 and HE3 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

Contact details:

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

Tel No: 01904 551657