# HARROGATE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING AREA2 DC COMMITTEE - AGENDA ITEM 6: LIST OF PLANS.

DATE: 8 February 2005

**PLAN:** 05 **CASE NUMBER:** 04/06183/OUT

**GRID REF: EAST** 436055 **NORTH** 448416

APPLICATION NO. 6.149.55.E.OUT DATE MADE VALID: 22.12.2004

**TARGET DATE:** 16.02.2005 **WARD:** Spofforth With Lower

Wharfedale

**APPLICANT:** Jellico Ltd

**AGENT:** Richard Crooks Partnership

**PROPOSAL:** Outline application for erection of 1 detached dwelling with siting and

access considered (site area 0.096 hectares)

**LOCATION:** Crackhill Farm Main Street Sicklinghall Wetherby North Yorkshire LS22

4BD

#### REPORT

# SITE AND PROPOSAL

The site comprises the side garden of Crackhill Farm, and is currently laid out in a formal style with raised beds and terracing. There is a large green house towards the rear of the site. Crackhill Farm, no longer a working farm, comprises a large detached dwelling with a range of outbuildings which back onto the car park of the Scotts Arms public house, with a tennis court to the rear. Vehicle access to the existing dwelling is taken between the dwelling and the outbuildings, and this vehicle access continues beyond the existing dwelling past the tennis court to the paddock and stables to the rear. The existing house is in an L shape, mostly two storey with a single storey section to the rear, is stone built and has a frontage to Main Street as well as a significant frontage with a number of windows onto the side garden.

The application proposes the erection of a house in the front portion of the existing side garden, fronting onto Main Street. The existing vehicle access between the house and stables is proposed to serve the dwelling. The application is in outline, with only access and siting to be determined at this stage. The proposal is for a 3 bedroom dwelling.

There is an extant consent for extensive extension to the existing house which was granted permission in February of last year. An application has also been submitted for the conversion of the stable building to form 1 dwelling, this application is currently invalid.

# **MAIN ISSUES**

- 1. Principle
- 2. Residential and Visual Amenity

Area 2 Development Control Committee - Tuesday 08 February 2005 Agenda Item No. 06 (05) - Public Report

- 3. Access and Parking
- 4. Open Space

### RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

6.149.55.FUL - Swimming pool and ancillary facilities to replace existing tennis court : Approved 18.10.1988

6.149.55.A.FUL - Retrospective application for refurbishment of stables : Approved 18.10.1988

6.149.55.B.OUT - Outline application for the erection of a single storey extension to north elevation, two storey extension and single storey extension to east elevation and conservatory to west elevation, including access. : Approved 30.06.2003

6. 149.55.C.REM - Reserved matters application under outline permission no. 6.149.55.B.OUT for the erection of various one and two storey extensions and 1no conservatory with siting design external appearance and landscaping considered : Approved 23.02.2004

6.149.55.D.OUT - Outline application for the erection of 1no dwelling with siting and access considered: Withdrawn 05.07.2004

### CONSULTATIONS/NOTIFICATIONS

### **Parish Council**

Sicklinghall

# **Highway Authority**

No objection subject to conditions - refer to assessment

APPLICATION PUBLICITY

SITE NOTICE EXPIRY: 21.01.2005 PRESS NOTICE EXPIRY: 21.01.2005

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

**SICKLINGHALL PARISH COUNCIL -** Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- 1. Detrimental effect on existing very attractive house and garden
- 2. Lack of a comprehensive development brief for the whole area under the ownership of Jellico Limited. Stabling and house plot being sold off separately, what are the overall intentions of the owners\_
- 3. Impact on traffic
- 4. Impact on sewerage system which is already at capacity
- 5. Loss of attractive green area of open space in the village, removal of fine garden and presumably the greenhouse/conservatory? Existing garden enhances the whole village street scene

## 6. Overdevelopment

7. Siting of proposed new dwelling too close to the road giving a "cluttered" feel

# **OTHER REPRESENTATIONS -** 4 letters of representations have been received:

Crackhill Cottage, Main Street - Object strongly:

- would destroy a fine garden
- cluttered appearance to Main Street
- believes more applications will follow on this site
- More traffic using the shared entrance and even if some of the stables are demolished it will still be dangerous
- New house will only be a few feet from boundary and my side windows would look directly at the back of the house
- The building will detract from the attractive Main Street

Bank House, Main Street - Object for the following reasons:

- Increased volume of traffic
- light and space of Bank House and the rookery affected
- Application appears to be part of a larger redevelopment plan, a comprehensive development brief should be available for public inspection before permission is granted.
- If a house is permitted it should be located towards the back of the plot

Rock House Cottage - express the following concerns:

- Increased numbers of vehicles using one access for 3+ properties
- Building will be close to the road, in front of the property to the left
- No objections to previous application

#### Little Paddocks - Main Street

- Site is next to bend in narrow street
- Increased traffic on an already dangerous road
- Garage will be an eyesore, situated in the middle of nowhere
- Cramming a house in this space will spoil the open aspect of the village

#### **VOLUNTARY NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION - None undertaken.**

## RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

PPS1	Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Communities
PPG2	Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts
PPG3	Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing
PPG13	Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport
SPE2	North Yorkshire County Structure Plan Policy E2
SPH3	North Yorkshire County Structure Plan Policy H3
LPH06	Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy H6: Housing developments in the main settlements and villages
LPHX	Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy HX: Managed Housing Site Release
LPH05	Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy H5: Affordable Housing

LPA01 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy A1: Impact on the

- **Environment and Amenity**
- LPR04 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy R4: Open Space Requirements for New Residential Development
- LPGB05 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy GB5: Development within settlements in Green Belt
- LPHD20 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy HD20: Design of New Development and Redevelopment
- LPGB04 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy GB4: Requirements of Development in Green Belt

#### **ASSESSMENT OF MAIN ISSUES**

1. LAND USE PRINCIPLE - The site lies within the village of Sicklinghall, which is a settlement within the Green Belt. Sicklinghall has a defined development limit but is washed over by Green Belt. The proposal is therefore subject to Policy GB5. Policy GB5 is permissive of infill development only, within the development limit, subject to a number of criteria being met. Infill development is defined in the local plan as "The development of a small site which represents a gap in a a largely developed street frontage, or an area of existing development." In this case it is considered that the site lies within the defined development limit, and it constitutes infill development, by virtue of filling a gap in an otherwise built up frontage. The proposed development is therefore compliant with Policy GB5, in this regard. Policy GB5 also refers to the need to provide adequate levels of residential amenity and this issue is referred to below.

The site represents a previously developed site, being the garden area of the existing dwelling, and the site area is below 0.3Ha, and therefore the proposal is compliant with Policy HX. The site area is less than 0.1Ha and therefore there is no requirement for affordable housing under Policy H5.

2. RESIDENTIAL AND VISUAL AMENITY - The proposed dwelling is set well forward in the site, close to the back of pavement. This is a characteristic form of development in the area, and it is not considered that a dwelling in this location would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. However, a dwelling in this location would have a considerable impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of Crackhill Cottage. This house is set back from the road frontage and therefore the proposed dwelling would stand forward of this house, and even allowing for the trees on the boundary (if indeed these could be retained) it is considered the proposal would have an overbearing effect on the front aspect of this dwelling. In addition the 4 windows on the gable of Crackhill Cottage would overlook the rear of the proposed dwelling, again to the detriment of residential amenity. The relationship between the proposed dwelling and Crackhill Farm house is not good either, with the new dwelling being within only 9m of the side elevation on which there are many windows. This is unneighbourly and is considered would result in harm to both the occupants of the existing dwelling and also to the occupants of the new dwelling from overlooking of their rear garden area from a large number of windows in the existing dwelling.

There is further concern over the impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of Crackhill Farm due to the noise and disturbance created by vehicles passing in close proximity to their dwelling to access the new dwelling, particularly if the extant permission for the extensions to Crackhill Farm House are implemented, which would bring the existing dwelling even closer to the proposed access.

The proposal, for the reasons given above, is therefore considered to result in a detriment to the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwelling, Crackhill Cottage, the existing dwelling, Crackhill Farm House, and would also provide a poor level of residential amenity for the new dwelling. it is therefore contrary to Policies A1, H6 and HD20 of the adopted HDLP.

- **3. CAR PARKING AND ACCESS -** There are currently two vehicular accesses to Crackhill Farm, the main vehicular access is taken between the existing house and the outbuildings, and there is a second access, with large metal gates across it to the other side of the existing dwelling, which leads onto an area of hard standing to the front of the dwelling. The access for the new dwelling is proposed from the existing access between the existing dwelling and the stables. This access is proposed to be improved by demolishing part of the end of the stable building, thus increasing visibility to provide the necessary 2m x 90m in both directions. The existing access to the other side of the existing dwelling is to be closed up. The access to the new dwelling would pass between the stables and the existing house, and will wrap around the back of the existing house towards proposed garages located in the rear corner of the site. The County Highway Authority have no objection to the proposals so long as sufficient stable is demolished to allow the necessary visibility splay to be formed. No details of the exact extent of demolition and how the stables will be made good has been submitted as part of this application although these details could be required by condition, were the application to be approved.
- **4. OPEN SPACE -** This application is in outline only, should permission be granted a condition should be imposed requiring the calculation and payment of the open space commuted sum at reserved matters stage.

**CONCLUSION** - The proposed dwelling would result in an unacceptable reduction in residential amenity of the existing dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling, and would provide a low level of residential amenity for the occupants of the new dwelling, refusal is therefore recommended.

CASE OFFICER: Ms S Purvis

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be REFUSED. Reason(s) for refusal:-

The proposed development by virtue of the proposed siting of the dwelling and the proposed access arrangements is considered to be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants of both neighbouring dwellings and is also considered to provide a poor level of residential amenity for the proposed dwelling, contrary to Policies A1, H6 and HD20 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.

