

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: West & City Centre Area **Ward:** Micklegate
Date: 21 June 2007 **Parish:** Micklegate Planning Panel

Reference: 07/00586/FUL
Application at: 214 Bishopthorpe Road York YO23 1LF
For: Alteration to roof at rear to provide new sheer second floor level
(retrospective)
By: James Herbert
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 8 May 2007

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application is for planning permission for a roof extension which has been added at the host and neighbour - 212 (application 07/00588/FUL). The extension follows up from the rear elevation and covers the entire rear roof plane. The face is in brick and has a French door with Juliet balcony outside. The sides have been finished in lead. The roof is flat, concealed by a parapet at the top of the structure.

1.2 The application relates to a terraced dwellinghouse with a two-storey outshot. The terrace is of similar house types.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams Central Area 0002

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design

CYH7 Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

3.1 Highway Network Management - No objection.

EXTERNAL

3.2 Planning Panel - Support the application.

3.3 Neighbour notification - One letter in support received from the occupant of 216 Bishopthorpe Road.

4.0 APPRAISAL

KEY ISSUES

4.1 The key issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area and whether there is material harm to the amenity of the occupiers of the surrounding properties.

RELEVANT POLICY

4.2 PPS1 seeks to deliver high quality development through good and inclusive design and states that design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area should not be accepted.

4.3 Policy H7 of the draft Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for house extensions where: the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development; the scale is appropriate; there is no adverse impact on residential amenity; proposals respect space between dwellings; and that the proposed development does not result in an unacceptable loss of private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling. The background text to policy H7 adds that large box style roof extensions shall generally be resisted. Policy GP1, reinforces H7, it sets out design guidance for all development proposals.

4.4 The Council also has supplementary planning guidance for house extensions. On the subject of dormer roof extensions it makes the following recommendations,

- Be well below the ridgeline of the roof
- Not extend the full width of the roof (2 smaller dormers preferable to 1 large one)
- Respect the proportions of the property and not extend across more than a third of the roof
- Relate to existing details including windows and doors in character, alignment and proportion
- Be clad in materials to match the existing roof

DESIGN

4.5 The roof extension has been built across two dwellings, taking up the entire roof slope of both. The scale of the extension makes it an overprominent structure, which dominates the roof. It is an uncommon disproportionate addition, which is out of keeping with the appearance of the host dwelling(s) and the terrace in which it is located. It is accepted that the materials used are sympathetic to the dwelling, however this does not mitigate the overall design, which is considered to be harmful in terms of character and appearance, contrary to PPS1 and H7 and GP1 of the Local Plan.

4.6 Officers are also mindful of the need for consistent decisions. An approach is taken by the Local Planning Authority which seeks to only approve sympathetically designed subordinate roof extensions. Although each decision should be made on its own merits, were retrospective consent to be granted in this case, it would be particularly difficult to resist similar large roof extensions in the locality, it is unlikely that all of which would be built / finished to a similar standard as the extension under consideration here. As such significant harm to the character and appearance of the area would occur. Examples of other roof extensions in the City have been submitted, in defence of the development now before members. These demonstrate that if the shape, size and location of dormer windows are not sympathetic, they cause harm to the appearance of their host building. If such extensions were used as justification to grant planning permission for similar development, there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the city.

AMENITY

4.7 The extension increases overlooking into neighbouring rear yard areas and also nearby windows serving living and bedrooms. However in such a high density area of terrace housing, overlooking to some extent is common and thus it is considered that it would be difficult to refuse the application on such grounds. In relation to the effect on neighbours in terms of overbearing and overdominance, it is considered that there would be no significant harm caused.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that the development is unacceptable because of its unsympathetic design. The structure is overprominent and harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling, its neighbour, and the locality, contrary to policies GP1 and H7 of the local plan and PPS1.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

- 1 The Local Planning Authority considers that the roof extension by virtue of its shape and overall size is an overprominent addition, which is unsympathetic and harmful to the appearance of 212 and 214 Bishopthorpe Road and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

As such the proposal is contrary to PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development which states that design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area should not be accepted and policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan. GP1 states that development proposals must, respect or enhance the local environment; be of a layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with the surrounding area; provide and protect amenity space; ensure no undue adverse impact from noise disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or

overdominance. H7 states that planning permission will be granted for house extensions where: the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development; the scale is appropriate; there is no adverse impact on residential amenity; and that the proposed development does not result in an unacceptable loss of private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Contact details:

Author: Jonathan Kenyon Development Control Officer

Tel No: 01904 551323