

Parish: Easingwold
Ward: Easingwold

7

Committee date: 7 February 2019
Officer dealing: Miss Ruth Hindmarch
Target date: 29 May 2018 (Extension of time agreement requested)

18/00597/FUL

Construction of a one bedroomed bungalow
At: 32 Crabmill Lane, Easingwold
For: Mr & Mrs Thornton

This application is referred to Planning Committee at the request of a Member of the Council.

1.0 SITE, CONTEXT AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application sites occupies most of the rear garden of 32 Crabmill Lane, Easingwold. The rear of the host property faces onto Central Avenue and the land to the rear of the application site forms the highway and a parking area. The site is bounded to the north by the adjoining property's rear garden, to the south is a recently constructed single storey dwelling and to the west is the host dwelling and remaining garden area.
- 1.2 Crabmill Lane and Central Avenue are within a residential area to the south east of the Market Square in Easingwold.
- 1.3 The application seeks consent to construction a one bedroom detached property within the existing rear garden area of the host property. The dwelling would be a modest bungalow providing a bedroom, bathroom, kitchen and living area. Part of the garden area would remain part of the curtilage of the host dwelling and would measure approximately 6.8m in depth by 11.3m wide. The host dwelling would have access to one of the existing parking spaces within Central Avenue.
- 1.4 The proposed bungalow is shown to be constructed about 7.2m wall to wall from the rear of 32 Crabmill Lane.
- 1.5 Improvements have been sought in an attempt to overcome issues with the proposal relating to conforming with Nationally Described Space Standards, and outlook from the living areas within the dwelling. The proposed dwelling in the amended scheme has an internal floor area (internal face external wall to external wall) of 49.51sqm (increased from the initial proposal of 43.16 sqm). The NDSS requirement for a single storey one bedroom two person dwelling is 50sqm and an additional 1.5sqm of built in storage space.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

32 Crabmill Lane

- 2.1 16/01639/FUL - Single storey one bedroomed dwelling; Withdrawn
- 2.2 17/01629/FUL - One bedroomed bungalow; Withdrawn

33 Crabmill Lane

- 2.3 16/00410/FUL - Demolition of outbuildings and construction of a single storey one bedroom dwelling; Granted May 2016. This planning permission has been implemented.

- 2.4 16/01902/FUL - Revised application for the demolition of outbuildings and construction of a single storey dwelling; Refused October 2016; dismissed at appeal.

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 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 DP32 - General design
Development Policies DP33 - Landscaping
National Planning Policy Framework – July 2018

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Town Council – Wishes to see the application approved.
- 4.2 Highway Authority – No objections subject to conditions.
- 4.3 Yorkshire Water – No objections subject to conditions.
- 4.4 Environmental Health Officer – No objection.
- 4.5 Public comments – Three comments have been received stating support for smaller, more affordable homes. One objection has been received stating the garden is too small for a dwelling and will cause more congestion due to building work and cars of occupiers and the absence of pedestrian access through the site to Crabmill Lane.

5.0 OBSERVATIONS

- 5.1 The main issues to consider are: (i) the principle of the development; (ii) design and impact on the character of the area; (iii) impact on neighbouring properties; (iv) amenity of proposed occupiers; and (v) highway matters.

Principle of development

- 5.2 The site is within the development limits of Easingwold and located in a sustainable location, approximately 400 meters from the Market Place and all the services that are offered there. As such, the proposal is considered to be a sustainable location for new development and would comply with Policy DP8.
- 5.3 The principle of residential development in this location is therefore acceptable subject to other material considerations detailed below.

Design and impact on the character of the area

- 5.4 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."

- 5.5 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.
- 5.6 The National Planning Policy Framework Planning supports this approach and, at paragraph 130, states that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 5.7 It is acknowledged the proposal consists of a modest sized dwelling which is low level and to some extent reflects the character of the recently constructed bungalow on the adjacent site however it is considered the scheme fails to achieve a high quality of design due to the previously largely undeveloped and open nature of this small site, leading to a loss of spaciousness and harmful to the visual amenity of the existing residential estate. Whilst the presence of the adjacent dwelling is acknowledged it is considered the addition of a further dwelling in this area would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area. The space would appear cramped and dominated by development. It is acknowledged the applicant has amended the plans to ensure the dwelling does not sit further south than the host dwelling and thereby retains some views from the end of Central Avenue through to Crabmill Lane however the addition of a further dwelling in this location is not considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity and the impact on the quality of the residential character of the area.
- 5.8 It is noted throughout this report that there has been an approval for a similar dwelling on the adjacent site at the rear of 33 Crabmill Lane and the dwelling has now been constructed. However there are a material differences between these two applications; the application site at 32 Crabmill Lane is an open garden, that previously contained two domestic greenhouses and two small timber sheds. The rest of the site was an open garden. The rear garden of 33 Crabmill Lane had been largely occupied by a large scale outhouse/garage.
- 5.9 The neighbouring dwelling also looks out towards garden areas to the south and does not have built development within such close proximity as the proposed dwelling would at this site and does therefore have a better outlook. It is considered the presence of this approval does not set a precedent for similar schemes such as that proposed as part of this application. It remains that case that each application must be considered on its own merits.

Impact on neighbouring properties

- 5.10 The dwelling is located in close proximity to a number of dwellings. The site plans indicates the distance between the rear elevation and the host dwelling, 32 Crabmill Lane would be approximately 7.2m. The location plan shows the site size and a separation distance between the site boundary and the rear of 32 Crabmill Lane of about 5m. The depth of the rear garden of 32 Crabmill Lane would be shallow and have a cramped appearance. Regardless of whether the boundary is formed between the existing and proposed dwelling at 5m or 7.2m from 32 Crabmill Lane the scheme would not result in a good standard of private amenity space for future occupiers of the host dwelling. There are no windows proposed immediately adjacent to the boundary with the host dwelling and the patio doors that are positioned further back within the site could be screened by adequate boundary fencing. Privacy to both dwellings can be safeguarded, however it is considered the presence of the dwelling would impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of No.32 in terms of a much reduced sense of space and openness and the resulting overbearing impact.

- 5.11 In terms of the recently constructed dwelling to the south, this contains an entrance door and small secondary window in the elevation that faces the application site. It is considered the presence of the proposed dwelling would not have such an undue impact that would warrant refusal.
- 5.12 The proposed dwelling would be located within close proximity to the boundary with 31 Crabmill Lane, the proposed dwelling would contain an entrance door and small bathroom window in this side elevation and it is not considered the impact in terms of overlooking would be significant. Given the siting of this neighbouring property it is not considered there would be a significant impact in terms of overbearing and overshadowing.

Amenity of proposed occupiers

- 5.13 The size of the dwelling has been increased but still falls 2sqm below the requirements in terms of Nationally Described Space Standards. The plans originally contained windows in the side elevation facing the recently constructed dwelling and it was considered this would not provide the required outlook for the proposed occupants. The drawings were amended to show the living room patio doors on the rear elevation facing the host property, set 3.3m from the boundary and approximately 10.5m from 32 Crabmill Lane. The outlook from this fenestration is less than ideal given the proximity to the boundary. The bedroom patio doors face south towards the boundary with the recently constructed dwelling and are set back from the boundary by approximately 6.0m and provide a better outlook however it is still less than ideal.
- 5.14 In terms of outside amenity space, the garden area provides approximately 35sqm however the shape of the space is not the most useable as it is a L shape. It is considered the amount of useable amenity space is limited but on balance would be acceptable if all other issues were acceptable.

Highway Impact

- 5.15 The submitted location plan shows the applicant owns three parking spaces/garage on Central Avenue and the proposed dwelling would have access to one of these parking spaces.
- 5.16 Access for the dwelling is to be off Central Avenue and so it would be reasonable to assume that any visitors requiring parking would park on Central Avenue, which is already congested by vehicles which adds to the oppressive appearance. To add a dwelling and additional parking to this area would have an unacceptable contribution to the existing situation, resulting in an area with is overdeveloped.

Conclusion

- 5.17 Whilst it is acknowledged the proposal would provide a smaller, more affordable property which is welcomed and the site offers a sustainable location in terms of proximity to the range of services and facilities offered in Easingwold; the site is too small to accommodate this dwelling and be able to offer an acceptable level of outdoor private amenity space to the host and proposed dwelling. The site is in a prominent position on Central Avenue and to grant permission on this open garden site would harm the character of the area and unacceptably reduce the green landscaping, which positively contributes to the overall impression of the area. The development would be visually intrusive in the street scene; therefore the proposed siting of the building would cause significant harm to the built environment. The scheme is considered to be contrary to the Hambleton Local Development Framework Policies CP1, CP17, DP1 and DP32.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 That subject to any outstanding consultations permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The development would result in a dwelling of cramped arrangement and appearance that does not respect the context of the site, fails to achieve a high quality of design and fails to secure the residential amenity of the occupiers of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties as required by Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP17 and Development Policies DP1 and DP32.
2. The size of the proposed dwelling falls short of the requirements of the Nationally Described Space Standards and therefore is contrary to the provisions of the Local Development Framework Policies CP8, DP13 and the Size, type and tenure Supplementary Planning Document.