

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: West/Centre Area
Date: 3 July 2007

Ward: Micklegate
Parish: Micklegate Planning Panel

Reference: 07/01237/FUL
Application at: York Promenade Working Mans Club And Institute 16 St
Benedict Road York YO23 1YA
For: Erection of 8no. two and three storey town houses and
associated works (amendment to previously approved scheme
07/00436/FUL)
By: Moorside Developments Ltd
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 16 July 2007

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application is a resubmission of 07/00436/FUL, which was approved by members at committee on 20 April 2007. The revised scheme proposes the same amount and size of dwellings, 8 houses, two 2-bed and six 3/4-bed.

1.2 The revised scheme proposes integral garages at the four central houses, the rooms lost at ground floor level being accommodated instead in the roofspace, and also the two end units now have a larger second bedroom in the roofspace, the small first floor room being instead proposed as a study. As a consequence of this the roof has changed, the ridge on the two end houses is 500mm higher, a mansard type roof is no longer featured in the scheme and the ridge of the four central houses is up by 1m. Because the four central houses would have a garage, they no longer have cycle stores in the rear yard, but they have small (1m by 2m) single storey rear extensions. In accordance with concerns raised by councillors previously, dwarf brick walls have replaced the soft planting between houses at the front.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Areas of Archaeological Interest City Centre Area 0006

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams Central Area 0002

Floodzone 2 Flood Zone 2 CONF

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1

Design

CYGP4A
Sustainability

CYH4A
Housing Windfalls

CYH5
Residential densities over 25 per ha

CYL1C
Provision of New Open Space in Development

CYED4
Developer contributions towards Educational facilities

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

Internal

3.1 Highway Network Management - ask that the conditions they recommended on the previous application be repeated. The recommended conditions were as follows,

HWAY 10 - vehicular areas surfaced and drained prior to occupation.

HWAY 13 - access onto road to be provided.

HWAY 17 - redundant crossing to be removed and kerb reinstated.

HWAY 19 - car and cycle parking laid out prior to occupation.

HWAY 25 - pedestrian visibility splays - 2m by 2m.

HWAY 31 - no mud on highway during construction.

HWAY 38 - off site highway works, relocation of existing speed bump details to be agreed.

Also informatives (including removal from respark) listed in section 7 of this report.

3.2 Lifelong Learning and Culture - Amount and size of housing is as previous so request that the same contribution toward open space is made - £10,771.

3.3 Drainage - No response to date - No objection when previous application approved.

3.4 Environmental Protection Unit - No response to date.

3.5 Design, Conservation and Sustainable Development - No response to date. Previously an archaeological watching brief was a condition because the site is within an area of archaeological importance.

3.6 Safer York Partnership (Police Architectural liaison Officer (ALO)) - No response to date. Comments made on previous application were taken into account;

previously the rear boundary treatment was amended. In this application garages have been proposed on some of the dwellings, these are preferred by the ALO as they offer secure storage space.

3.7 Education Officer - In last application a contribution towards primary and secondary education was requested - £35,859 (£10,164 per primary space, £15,531 per secondary place). The fees per space increased in March 2007 (previous application was submitted in February) to £10,648 per primary space, £16,270 per secondary space. As such the contribution this time would be higher - £37,566.

External

3.8 Planning Panel - No objection.

3.9 The application was publicised by site notice and letters of neighbour notification. The deadline for comments is 2 July 2007. No written representations have been made to date.

4.0 APPRAISAL

Key issues

4.1 As the principle of the scheme has been agreed and there have been no changes in policy since, the main consideration is whether the revised scheme is of acceptable appearance and whether there would be an adverse effect on the amenity of nearby occupants or highway safety.

Relevant policy

4.2 The main policies to consider are GP1, GP4a, H4 and H5. GP1 states that development proposals must, respect or enhance the local environment; be of a density, layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with the surrounding area; avoid the loss of open spaces which contribute to the quality of the local environment; retain, enhance, or create urban spaces; provide and protect amenity space; provide space for waste storage; ensure no undue adverse impact from noise disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or overdominance. GP4a states all proposals should have regard to the principles of sustainable development. H4a states that proposals for vacant land will be approved where the site has good accessibility to jobs, shops and services; and it is of an appropriate scale and density to surrounding development and it would not have a detrimental impact on existing landscape features. H5a states the scale and design of proposed residential developments should be compatible with the surrounding area and must not harm local amenity.

Appearance

4.3 The change in appearance mainly consists of the increased roof height and the introduction of garages and bay windows on the front elevation. The extra height to a certain extent is mitigated at the front by the bay windows that break up the vertical appearance of the elevation. The height of the development is comparable with the

block of housing beyond the garages to the west. In comparison to what was previously approved, officers consider that the resubmitted scheme, with a higher roof, would not have a significant effect on the appearance of the area.

4.4 The proposed garage doors within the front elevation would not be prominent in the street scene. The bay windows again have a similar effect in distracting the eye from the four garages and only half of the houses would have the garages.

Residential amenity

4.5 There is a separation distance of 23m and 25m respectively to the nearest elevations of the two/ three-storey buildings (which include residential accommodation above ground floor level) that front Bishopthorpe Road and the three storey housing unit to the west. It is considered that although the building would be prominent, the additional height in relation to that approved previously would not have a significant effect on outlook and nor would it be overbearing over the residential units that surround.

4.6 In the interests of public safety it can again be a condition that street lighting around the site is provided by the developer.

Sustainability

4.7 The application as submitted is not supported with a sustainability statement and previously it was advised that the developer would be unwilling to pay for a BREEAM assessment, given that building regulations require a similar standard of sustainable housing. However, in addition to a requirement to comply with building regulations, the proposed development benefits (in terms of sustainability) from its design, which offers some energy and materials savings, by proposing terraced properties that are more efficient than semi detached properties. Also the location itself is sustainable in that it is located within walking distance of jobs, services, amenities and public transport facilities.

Contributions

4.8 As per the previous approval, if permission were to be granted, contributions toward off site open space and education would be required. The contribution is as previous and has been agreed by the applicant (tbc).

Highways

4.9 There are no significant alterations from the previously approved scheme, which did not give rise to any highway safety concerns. Highway Network Management have raised no objections to the scheme and provided the recommended conditions are attached and complied with, the impact on highway safety would be acceptable.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and highway safety and there would be no undue effect on the amenity of surrounding occupants.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

- 1 PLANS1 Approved Plans
- 2 TIME2 Devt to start within 3 years
- 3 VISQ8 Materials to be submitted
- 4 HWAY10 Vehicle areas surfaced before occupation
- 5 HWAY13 Access onto road provided
- 6 The development shall not be occupied until all existing vehicular crossings not shown as being retained on the approved plans have been removed by reinstating the kerb to match adjacent levels.

Reason: In the interests of good management of the highway and road safety.
- 7 HWAY19 Car and cycle parking laid out prior to occupation
- 8 HWAY25 2m x 2m ped. visibility splays
- 9 HWAY31 No mud on highway
- 10 HWAY38 Relocation of existing speed bump to be agreed
- 11 Prior to commencement of the development details of security lighting to be installed to the rear of the development, and thereafter maintained, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the security of the residents of the development.
- 12 HT1 11m
- 13 S106OS Open space contribution required
- 14 S106E Education contribution required
- 15 ARCH2 Arch watching brief required

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 amenity, design and highway safety. As such the proposal complies with Policy H6 of the North Yorkshire County Structure Plan (Alteration No.3 Adopted 1995) and Policies GP1, GP4a, H4a, H5a, C3, L1c and ED4 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

2. 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

3. You are advised that this proposal may have an affect on Statutory Undertakers equipment. You must contact all the utilities to ascertain the location of the equipment and any requirements they might have prior to works commencing.

4. The applicant is asked to note that the development/property (as proposed), is considered not to be eligible for inclusion within the Residents Parking Zone, and it will be removed from such under the Traffic Regulations 1984.

Upon commencement of development on the site the applicant is requested to contact the Council's Network Management Section (tel 01904 551450) in order that the amendments to the Residents Parking Scheme can be implemented prior to the occupation of the development.

5. The applicant's attention is drawn to potential crime reduction by considering the Police 'Secured by Design' Award Scheme for this site. Full details and an application form for the scheme can be found on www.securedbydesign.com

Contact details:

Author: Jonathan Kenyon Development Control Officer
Tel No: 01904 551323