**DELEGATED** 

AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE

**DATE 4 February 2009** 

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

08/3631/REV
79A High Street, Yarm,
Revised application for erection of two-storey extension to the rear.

# **Expiry Date 17 February 2009**

#### **SUMMARY**

- 1. The application seeks planning permission for a two-storey extension including sunroom and balcony to the rear of 79a High Street Yarm.
- 2. The application has been submitted by Councillor J Earl, under the local authority scheme of delegation the application must be determined by planning committee.
- 3. Although an extension to the property is considered acceptable in principle and the applicant has made changes to the original proposal, the design of the current proposal is considered to be unacceptable and the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

# **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning application 08/3631/REV be refused for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the design and details of the proposed extension are considered to be out of character and unsympathetic to the existing property and wider conservation area and is therefore contrary to the saved policies HO12 and EN24 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan in that it will not preserve or enhance the character of the Yarm conservation area.

## **BACKGROUND**

- 4. The application is a revised proposal for application 08/2747/FUL, submitted in 2008 and subsequently withdrawn. The applicant was advised to revise the proposals, which were considered to be unacceptable due to size, scale and general design.
- 5. The current proposal is a revision of the previous scheme which has seen the general size and bulk of the extension reduced although a sunroom and balcony have now been added.

# **PROPOSAL**

- 6. The application seeks planning permission for a two-storey extension to the rear of 79a High Street Yarm.
- 7. The application will involve the demolition of an existing garage for which conservation area consent for demolition will also be required. The building is in poor repair and there is no objection in principle to the loss of the building.
- 8. The extension would accommodate a large living room with central chimney and spiral stair, sunroom and cloakroom at ground floor level with French doors opening into the garden area. The first floor would have a bedroom, bathroom and balcony area. The bedroom would also have glazed doors and a Juliet balcony facing into the garden. The first floor accommodation would also be reached through the existing dwelling house as well as the spiral stair case.
- 9. The extension would involve the removal of an existing silver birch tree and there is no objection from the local authority arborist to its removal.

#### **CONSULTATIONS**

The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below:-

## **Environmental Health Unit**

No objection in principle to the development, however, recommend the conditions as detailed be imposed on the development should it be approved.

# Construction Noise

All construction operations including delivery of materials on site shall be restricted to 8.00 a.m. - 6.00 p.m on weekdays, 9.00 a.m. - 1.00 p.m. on a Saturday and no Sunday or Bank Holiday working.

# Unexpected land contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, works must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination and it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority prior to resumption of the works.

# **Natural England**

No comments received-(no objections to the previous scheme, bat survey has shown no evidence of bats in the building to be demolished)

#### **Tees Archaeology**

The proposal occupies the same footprint as at present and is unlikely to cause significant disturbance to archaeological deposits. I therefore have no objection to the application and have no further comments to make.

Recommend a building recording condition

#### **Urban Design Engineers**

All developments should be designed and constructed in accordance with the SBC Design Guide and Specification and SPD3: Provision for New Developments.

Following confirmation that 2 dwellings share the 4 space car parking area indicated on the plans and that 79A High Street has an additional existing double garage. I have no objection to this application subject to both dwellings having a maximum number of 3 bedrooms

#### **PUBLICITY**

10. Neighbours were notified by means of letter, site notice (expiry 27<sup>th</sup> January) Press Advert (expiry 30<sup>th</sup> January) and the following comments were received.

Mrs P Grainge 125 High Street, Yarm

## Objects to the application

Concerned about the closing up of the space between the existing building and garage plus the increased height of the extension which may reduce natural light to the properties to the North side of the properties development Manor House Mews and could be detrimental to future sale of these properties.

If approved access should be through High Church Wynd and not Manor House Mews as this would create disturbance for residents.

Need for scaffolding to the rear of the proposed new building would need to be situated in manor house mews courtyard and this may make car access impossible causing inconvenience to residents.

Also concerned over refuse storage. The small building attached to the garage has always been recognised as a bin store for Merrits and the cottages in Manor House Mews and understood this was a condition of ownership.

# **PLANNING POLICY**

The relevant development plan in this case is the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permissions shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application:-

# **Policy GP1**

Proposals for development will be assessed in relation to the policies of the Cleveland Structure Plan and the following criteria as appropriate:

- (i) The external appearance of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area:
- (ii) The effect on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties;
- (iii) The provision of satisfactory access and parking arrangements;
- (iv) The contribution of existing trees and landscape features;
- (v) The need for a high standard of landscaping;
- (vi) The desire to reduce opportunities for crime;
- (vii) The intention to make development as accessible as possible to everyone:
- (viii) The quality, character and sensitivity of existing landscapes and buildings;

- (ix) The effect upon wildlife habitats;
- (x) The effect upon the public rights of way network.

# **Policy EN24**

New development within conservation areas will be permitted where:

- (i) The siting and design of the proposal does not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area; and
- (ii) The scale, mass, detailing and materials are appropriate to the character and appearance of the area

## **Policy EN25**

The demolition of buildings and other structures which require consent for demolition within conservation areas will not be permitted unless:

- (i) It can be shown that the loss is not detrimental to the character or appearance of the conservation area: or
- (ii) The structural condition renders it unsafe; or
- (iii) The structure is beyond reasonable economic repair.

Conditions will normally be imposed to secure the satisfactory redevelopment of the site.

# Policy HO12

Where planning permission is required, all extensions to dwellings should be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and should avoid significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties.

Permission for two-storey rear extensions close to a common boundary will not normally be granted if the extension would shadow or dominate neighbouring property to a substantial degree.

Permission for two-storey side extensions close to a common boundary will not normally be granted unless they are set back from the boundary or set back from the front wall of the dwelling

SPG 2-Householder extension and design guide

#### SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 11. The property is situated within the Yarm conservation area to the rear of number 79 High Street which is a grade II listed building.
- 12. The site is surrounded by residential properties including a 1950's dormer bungalow situated to the rear, Church Wynd House which is also owned by the applicant.
- 13. The rear of the High Street is characterised by a tightly knitted grain of development consequently the site is relatively private and not visible to the wider conservation area.
- 14. The rear of number 79a faces into Low Church Wynd and is overlooked by Manor House Mews which are approximately 9m from the existing dwelling with number 3 approximately 4.5m from the garden boundary of 79a.
- 15. Pedestrian access is available through a private High Street entrance with vehicle access from High Church Wynd, the site currently has parking provision for 6 cars which is shared with Church Wynd House.

16. 79a High Street property is two storeys, of a local vernacular, built from local Georgian brick with deep eaves and a clay pantile roof. Its simple domestic scale and style is typical of the traditional character of Yarm with grand town houses facing the High Street with lower scale properties to the rear traditionally outbuildings or cottages. The property has Yorkshire sliding sashes and the property is low in height due to its age, which traditional sees lower ceiling heights. The property faces into a Wynd and has outdoor amenity space including a large double garage with storage and an additional garage proposed to be demolished.

# **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

17. The main considerations of the application are the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Yarm conservation area, the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, the loss of the existing outbuilding and the requirements of the development plan.

# The impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Yarm conservation area

- 18. The existing garage is two stories in height of traditional brick and pantile construction with evidence of earlier stone work incorporated; there is a garage door which faces into Low Church Wynd. A structural survey has been prepared in support of demolition of the structure which states it is in poor repair. Although the building is not modern the loss of the building is not considered to adversely affect the conservation area as it has no specific merit.
- 19. The application proposes to demolish the garage and erect a two-storey extension including a single storey sun room and balcony on a similar footprint.
- 20. The existing property is 5.4m in height and the proposed extension will be 5.2m in height to the ridge.

The existing garage measures 5.3m in height by 4.2m wide.

The gable of the proposed extension measures 5.4m in height by 4.2m wide.

The general scale and massing of the proposal is similar to the existing garage although attaching to the main house will create infill at first floor level.

- 21. The extension steps forward from the existing building line by 0.9m of a metre at the widest point where it joins the main dwelling gradually decreasing in width due to the angled nature of the site.
- 22. Features such as the use of barge boards on the gable, the gothic window and poorly detailed windows of the sunroom conflict with the contemporary approach and create an overall result which is not sympathetic or in character with the main house. Extensions, by their very nature, should be subservient in design and fit with the architectural detailing of the main property the proposal appears dominant not due to scale and massing but as a result of the design.
- 23. An extension to the property is considered in principle acceptable. However, the resulting impact of the proposed design does little to preserve or enhance the character of the main property or the conservation area.

- 24. The fenestration does not follow the rhythm of the existing property and the overall design jars with the existing house. The windows in the extension are mismatched and although glazing may be appropriate there needs to be a co-ordinated approach to the design in the extension itself and to reflect that of the main house.
- 25. It is considered that the design could be greatly improved by the following:
  - stepping back of the extension in line with the existing building line of 79a to reduce the dominance
  - appropriate detailing of the windows looking at the rhythm and dominant lines of the existing property
  - Replication of the existing eaves detailing
  - Simplification of the design overall
  - A uniform approach in terms of window detailing to reflect the main property and through the extension (simplification of the gothic window and reworking of the sunroom)

# The impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties

- 26. There has been one letter of neighbour objection to the proposal on the grounds of loss of light to Manor House Mews, potential impact on parking and loss of refuse storage for Manor House Mews
- 27. It is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours the rear gothic window would be obscurely glazed and the balcony is screened by the proposed cloakroom extension. The main windows of the extension will look in the garden courtyard area and there are no properties directly overlooked and significant distances between the adjacent properties to ensure no overlooking or loss of light.
- 28. Church Wynd house to the rear is 25m from the extension and the balcony will look on the front garden of this property. This substantial distance is considered sufficient to ensure the amenities of this property are not adversely affected.
- 29. Vehicle and pedestrian access to the property will remain unchanged. Any need for scaffolding to construct the development and location of this would be a civil issue outside the remit of the planning system. The bin storage referred to is a small recess of the boundary wall of 79a High St which is in the ownership of the applicant. Subsequently this is within the applicants control and is a civil issue.
- 30. The proposed extension has a similar height and bulk to the existing garage. The existing boundary wall is over 2m in height and the infilling between the existing house and garage is not considered to have an overly dominant impact on the neighbours at Manor House Mews and it is not considered that there will be an adverse impact on these neighbours as a result of the extension.
- 31. The neighbouring properties to the North elevation of the site, the Mews are stepped. Numbers 1 and 2 are located directly to the rear of the existing garage.
- 32. Number 1 the Mews is approximately 9.5m to the rear, 2 the Mews is approximately 6m from the proposed cloaks extension and 3 the Mews 4m from the garden boundary of 79a, which will remain unchanged by the proposal.
- 33. As the proposed extension is similar in height and massing to the existing garage and the infill section between the house and extension will not be any more dominant than the

- existing, it is not considered that there will en adverse impact on the amenity of the residents at number 1 the Mews in terms of dominance or impact on windows.
- 34. The single storey entrance and cloaks has a pitched roof forming a gable wall on the east elevation the roof will be used to screen the balcony from Manor House Mews to the north. The form, materials and pitch of the roof are consistent with others in Yarm. The cloaks extension will be approximately 1 and half stories in height and it is not considered that there will be an adverse impact on number 2 the Mews in terms of overlooking from the balcony or an overbearing impact from the cloaks extension.
- 35. It is considered that Number 3 the Mews will also be unaffected from the proposals as the cloaks extension will provide the needed screening form the balcony and the window relationship with this property and that of the east elevation of the extension are such oblique views that overlooking will not occur.
- 36. The Head of Technical Services has no objection to the proposal and it is considered that there is sufficient car parking on site both for 79a High Street and Church Wynd House.
- 37. It is therefore considered that the application does not have an adverse impact on the amenities of residents within adjacent properties or the highway network.

# The loss of the existing outbuilding and the requirements of the development plan.

- 38. The existing garage is two stories in height of traditional brick and pantile construction with evidence of earlier stone work incorporated; there is a garage door which faces into Low Church Wynd. A structural survey has been prepared in support of demolition of the structure which states it is in poor repair. Although the building is not modern the loss of the building is not considered to adversely affect the conservation area as it has no specific merit. A building recording condition would ensure any features of interest are recorded.
- 39. The applicant has revised their proposal to address some of the local authorities concerns; however, the existing proposals still do not address the concerns regarding the resulting overall design and the resulting impact on the character of the property and the conservation area.
- 40. The extension in its current form is not considered to preserve or enhance the conservation area and is considered to be contrary to policies HO12 and EN24.

#### **CONCLUSION**

41. The proposal is considered to be unacceptable in terms of its design which does not sit well with the main house. The proposal is considered to conflict with policies HO12 and EN24 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan. The application is recommend for Refusal for the reasons outlined above.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services Contact Officer Mrs Fiona Bage Telephone No 01642 526271

Financial Implications – None

**Environmental Implications - As Report** 

# **Community Safety Implications - N/A**

# **Human Rights Implications**

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

**Background Papers** - Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan, SPG3: Parking Provision for New Developments

# WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward Yarm

Ward Councillor Councillor J Earl

Ward Yarm

Ward Councillor Councillor Mrs J. Beaumont,

Ward Yarm

Ward Councillor Councillor A B L Sherris