

Parish: Easingwold

Ward: Easingwold

6

Committee date: 15th November 2018

Officer dealing: Miss Charlotte Cornforth

Target date: 21st September 2018

18/01120/REM

**Application for approval of reserved matters (scale/appearance/landscape and layout) following outline planning permission - 17/02409/OUT on 12 January 2018 - construction of an attached dwelling with an integral garage and two vehicular access At Wayside, 1 Oulston Road, Easingwold
For Mr Andrew Tooze**

This application is referred to Planning Committee at the request of Members of the Council. Furthermore, the outline approval was decided by Planning Committee.

1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL

1.1 The application site of Wayside, 1 Oulston Road is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on the eastern side of the street. The plot has vehicular access to the front with a driveway to the side of the house leading to the detached single garage of 1 Oulston Road. The property is the first of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings of a similar style to the north of the site, to the south of the site is a detached bungalow with attached flat roof garage to side known as Richmondgarth.

1.2 The site is adjacent to but not within the Easingwold Conservation Area, which encompasses a small number of properties on the western side of the street. The street has a suburban residential character with some mature trees opposite the application site; however there are no trees within the application site.

1.3 The principle of development for one attached dwelling and the access to the site were agreed as part of the outline application. The matters for approval at this stage are scale, appearance, landscaping and layout.

1.4 Changes have been made throughout the course of the application. These include having a first floor brick link between the existing dwelling 1 Oulston Road and the proposed dwelling. The roof form of the dwelling has also been changed to incorporate a hipped roof. This would be used as storage space for the new dwelling accessed through a bedroom. An integral garage and bay windows are proposed to the front of the dwelling.

1.5 The dwelling is shown to be constructed from brick, with natural red clay pantiles. The windows are to be white uPVC, with a composite front door and black uPVC rainwater goods. There is shown to be a canopy over the front door. A single storey rear off shoot to serve as a kitchen is also shown.

1.6 The agent has stated the following with regard to the revised scheme:

"We are striving to create a design for a house which will fit in with the general character of the mix of houses in this part of Oulston Road. We have tried to reflect the appearance of the two pairs of hipped roofed houses to the north, and the recently built detached houses opposite. Aware of concerns expressed by neighbours, we are trying to keep the height of the new house to the absolute minimum.

Taking into consideration your comments about the necessary link between the new house and 1 Oulston Road, I now show a brick first floor section between the two houses. This will provide a strong physical link between the buildings, yet will minimise the loss of light to existing windows in the southern wall of 1 Oulston Road. It will not involve any alteration to the roof of the existing house, meaning that its particular character will not be jeopardised.

This amended scheme includes a substantial masonry link between the houses, minimises the impact on the amenities of 1 Oulston Road, fits reasonably well with the mix of buildings in the area, and largely dispels the objections of neighbours.”

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

2.1 17/01260/OUT - Planning permission refused 12.10.2017 - Construction of a detached dwelling with associated garage and access. The reasons for refusal were:

1. The proposal would result in over development of the site resulting in a loss to the quality of the residential environment. The development would give a cramped appearance to the surroundings in contrast to the context of the site that has a relatively wide spacing of dwellings. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Local Development Framework Policies CP1, CP17 and DP32.
2. The parking arrangements on the site are considered to be likely to give rise to on-street parking and parking on the frontage of the proposed and existing dwelling that would harm the uncluttered appearance of the street contrary to the Local Development Framework Policies CP1, CP2, DP3 and DP4, CP17 and DP32.

2.2 17/02409/OUT - Outline application for the construction of an attached dwelling with an integral garage and two vehicular access points; Approved 12.01.2018.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 The relevant policies are:

Core Strategy Policy CP1 - Sustainable development
Core Strategy Policy CP2 – Access
Core Strategy Policy CP4 - Settlement hierarchy
Core Strategy Policy CP8 – Type, size and tenure of housing
Core Strategy Policy CP16 - Protecting and enhancing natural and man-made assets
Core Strategy Policy CP17 - Promoting high quality design
Development Policies DP1 - Protecting amenity
Development Policies DP3 - Site accessibility
Development Policies DP4 - Access for all
Development Policies DP8 - Development Limits
Development Policies DP10 - Form and character of settlements
Development Policies DP30 – Protecting the character and appearance of the countryside
Development Policies DP32 - General design
Development Policies DP33 - Landscaping
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – published July 2018

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Parish Council – wishes to see the application refused as it does not meet the requirements of the outline planning permission and it is an overdevelopment of the site which has 2 semi-detached houses already.

- 4.2 Highway Authority – no objection, subject to conditions regarding discharge of surface water, private access construction requirements, parking for dwellings, precautions to prevent mud on the highway and on-site parking, on-site storage and construction traffic during development.
- 4.3 Yorkshire Water - Company records indicate a public sewer crosses the red line site boundary. The presence of the main may affect the layout of the site and therefore I consider it to be a material consideration in the determination of this application.
- 4.4 Public comments – 10 letters of objection have been received regarding both the initial 21 day consultation and the 10 day re-consultation. It should be noted that a number of the objections are multiple submissions. A summary of their objections are as follows:
- The plans submitted show what is in effect a detached house, squashed onto a totally inadequate site and constituting over-development of the worst kind.
 - If there is going to be an adjoining dwelling without damaging the street scene too much, it should be accommodated under a roof extension of the existing villas and thereby integrated with the existing buildings.
 - It is important to ensure that the external appearance of the development is compatible with the immediate surroundings on the site by creating a terrace to continue the hipped roof and level frontage of the semi-detached villa it is attached to.
 - As the owner of the adjoining property, 2 Oulston Road, I have grave concerns to the proposed development of this plot, with particular regards to the idea of an adjoining property, on what can only be described as the tightest of possible plots. I must counter the comments raised by others that this proposed dwelling must form a totally attached addition to the existing dwelling, as this would create a totally unacceptable and unsightly terrace block, which would have adverse effects on the current street scene, and value of my adjoining property.
 - The detailed parking proposals now presented stand in stark contrast to this picture. Additional parking is proposed on the former Number 1 Oulston Road site at the direct cost of front garden space, entailing two adjacent road accesses in place of the previous single access. The unavoidable impact here, exacerbated by the access of Richmond Garth, only 7 metres away, is a significant harm to the appearance and quality of the street environment through parking clutter.
 - The joining of the adjacent hipped roofs in the gutter formation would look quite incongruous in the street scene, with the new building giving the distinct impression that it was trying to be a separate building but had somehow slipped and ended up with its roof leaning against the adjacent semi-detached house.

5.0 OBSERVATIONS

- 5.1 The main issues to consider are: (i) design; (ii) residential amenity; (iii) heritage assets; (iv) access and highway safety; (v) drainage

Design

- 5.2 One of Hambleton's strategic planning objectives, set out in The Core Strategy Local Development Document (2007), is "To protect and enhance the historic heritage and the unique character and identity of the towns and villages by ensuring that new developments are appropriate in terms of scale and location in the context of settlement form and character."
- 5.3 Policies CP17 and DP32 require the highest quality of creative, innovative and sustainable design for buildings and landscaping that take account of local character

and settings, promote local identity and distinctiveness and are appropriate in terms of use, movement, form and space.

- 5.4 Consideration should be given to the outline planning approval. The indicative submitted plans as part of the outline approval (17/02409/OUT) suggested that the attachment of the proposed dwelling was at full height to the host dwelling as the plans showed a continuation of the roof form.
- 5.5 The attachment as part of this reserved matters application is a first floor brick link between the existing dwelling 1 Oulston Road and proposed dwelling. This would be used as storage space for the new dwelling. This is set back from the host dwelling.
- 5.6 This first floor link is not considered to have the degree of attachment that officers and members understood would be the case as part of the outline approval or required to achieved the 'linked' appearance that is required to make the scheme acceptable.
- 5.7 It is acknowledged that design changes have been made to the scheme, including a hipped roof form which is more in keeping with the street scene. The eaves line is lower than the existing dwelling but appears to sit at odds with the host dwelling. The building line of the proposed dwelling also sits 0.5 metres forward from the host dwelling.
- 5.8 It is considered that the proposal will result in over development of the site resulting in a loss to the quality of the residential environment. The development would give a cramped appearance to the surroundings in contrast to the context of the site that has a relatively wide spacing of dwellings.
- 5.9 The reserved matters has not been brought forward in a way that was suggested at outline, with the description of the outline being "*Outline application for the construction of an attached dwelling with an integral garage and two vehicular access points*". Whilst there is a degree of attachment through a first floor brick link, this is considered to be an insufficient attachment. The proposed dwelling would be read as a detached dwelling due to its projecting building line, the roof form being 'detached' from the host dwelling and the link sitting back from the host dwelling. The resulting development would appear 'disjointed' and not respecting the local context that does not pay due regard to the requirement for high quality detailing and is therefore contrary to LDF Policies CP17 and DP32.

Residential amenity

- 5.10 The plot that the host dwelling occupies is substantial with a generous rear garden and wide side garden, being the first of a run of four semi-detached properties the application plot has a notably wider side garden than those between the properties to the north. The variety in house types in the vicinity are reflected in a variety of plot sizes and forms, as such there is not a uniformly characteristic plot size or layout that could be said to define the street other than that the properties are within spacious gardens. Subdivision and the introduction of an additional dwelling would not as a matter of principle be detrimental to the character of the area, it is on this basis that outline approval has been given.
- 5.11 While the plot enjoyed by 1 Oulston Road at present would be evidently altered, parking and private amenity space would still be afforded for both the existing and proposed property.
- 5.12 It was acknowledged as part of the outline approval that the space available within the site is sufficient for an additional attached dwelling to be accommodated while still

achieving necessary separation distances in order to protect privacy and prevent overlooking.

- 5.13 However, the degree of attachment as part of this reserved matters application is limited and this has resulted in a dwelling being positioned closer to the southern boundary of the site and therefore closer towards the dwelling of Richmondgarth. There would be two south facing windows, one serving the sitting room at ground floor level and one serving an en-suite at first floor level. These can be conditioned to be obscure glazed and thereby overcomes any significant harm to the amenity of neighbours.

Heritage assets

- 5.14 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Council to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Easingwold Conservation Area.
- 5.15 On assessment of the application it is considered that it would not lead to harm to heritage assets. The site is not within the Easingwold Conservation Area, but rather the boundary of the conservation area encompasses the Edwardian terrace of properties on the western side of Oulston Road. Those properties are identified in the Conservation Area appraisal as fine examples of their type, however the appraisal goes on to describe the remainder of Oulston Road as being later 20th Century suburban developments in very different in character to the Conservation Area. This assessment makes clear this is the reason the remainder of Oulston Road is not included in the Conservation Area.
- 5.16 The proposed development would be in keeping with the suburban form of Oulston Road and would not therefore diminish the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Access and highway safety

- 5.17 The assessment of the Highway Authority is that a suitable vehicular access from Oulston Road to serve both properties can be achieved along with sufficient parking arrangements made within the two plots. On that basis no objections have been raised subject to conditions.
- 5.18 While acknowledging that the existing arrangement for the semi-detached properties in the street is driveways to the side with detached garages set towards the rear, this is not uniform throughout the street. Some properties are served by attached garages with parking area to the front; others do not have dedicated in-curtilage parking provision. Parking provision within front gardens is apparent within the locality and would adequately serve the proposed dwellings.
- 5.19 In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would cause harm the appearance of the locality due to the poor design.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:
1. The proposal would have a cramped appearance to the surroundings in contrast to the context of the site that has a relatively wide spacing of dwellings. The reserved matters has not been brought forward in a way that was suggested at outline, with the description for the outline being "*Outline application for the construction of an attached dwelling with an integral garage and two vehicular access points*". The

degree of attachment through a first floor brick link, is considered to be an insufficient attachment and the proposed dwelling would be read as a detached dwelling due to its projecting building line, roof form being 'detached' from the host dwelling and the link sitting back from the host dwelling would give a 'disjointed' appearance. This would cause significant harm to the built environment, the scheme does not respect the local context and does not pay due regard to the requirement for high quality detailing and is contrary to the Hambleton Local Development Framework Policies CP1, CP17 and DP32 and the National Planning Policy Framework.