HARROGATE BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

DATE: 11 October 2005

PLAN: 06 **CASE NUMBER:** 05/02378/FUL

GRID REF: EAST 435798 **NORTH** 456905

APPLICATION NO. 6.100.2463.FUL **DATE MADE VALID:** 25.08.2005

TARGET DATE: 20.10.2005

WARD: Knaresborough East

APPLICANT: Mr And Mrs A Hetherington

AGENT: Mr D Beckwith

PROPOSAL: Erection of extension to form one additional attached dwelling.

LOCATION: 2 Princess Avenue Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0AW

REPORT

SITE AND PROPOSAL

No.2 Princess Avenue is the first property on the north side of the street which comprises semi-detached properties.

This bungalow currently has a side drive/garage and lies to the west, and elevated above, other bungalows on Chain Lane.

The proposal is to erect a further dwelling, built as an extension to the side of No.2, and replacing the garage.

The dwelling would be an unusual one bedroomed design, with the main side wall and roof pulling back from the highway at an oblique angle.

Both the new and existing properties would have a very small and narrow garden and the existing gates/drive would provide access to both dwellings.

MAIN ISSUES

- 1. Policy Matters
- 2. Appearance
- 3. Amenity of Neighbours
- 4. Highways/Parking

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

None.

CONSULTATIONS/NOTIFICATIONS

Parish Council

Knaresborough

Chief Engineer (H and T)

Advises one condition requiring 3 off street parking spaces

APPLICATION PUBLICITY

SITE NOTICE EXPIRY: 30.09.2005 **PRESS NOTICE EXPIRY:** 30.09.2005

REPRESENTATIONS

KNARESBOROUGH TOWN COUNCIL - Object on following grounds:-

- 1. The proposed dwelling would detrimentally change the character of the area, which is of semi-detached dwellings with reasonable sized gardens.
- 2. The scale of proposed development is overintensive for the size of site.
- 3. The scale of the proposed development and its proximity to the side boundary will detrimentally effect the amenity of residents on Chain Lane.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS - 9 letters of objection have been received from No's 4, 5, 7 and 8 Princess Avenue and 74, 76 and 78 Chain Lane and 4 Princess Mount which state:-

- 1. Road is very busy and narrow and on-street parking is already a problem.
- 2. Will lead to obstruction of drives.
- 3. Out of keeping with pleasant residential area spoils ambience of area.
- 4. Too large for site and over-development.
- 5. Loss of garaging will lead to parking near to junction.
- 6. This is another house attached to No.2 and unsuitable for locality.
- 7. Will deprive us of open aspect enjoyed since 1958.
- 8. Result in loss of light.
- 9. De-valuation of property.
- 10. Semi-bungalow will become a terrace.
- 10. Plan is inaccurate.
- 11. No right of access to rear access lane residents only not a public right of way.
- 12. New dwelling will have no rear access.
- 13. Double drive will be out of keeping.
- 14. Will make pathways (unlit) very dark due to height of bungalow it will become unsafe.
- 15. Loss of privacy to our garden will result.
- 16. Loss of view.
- 17. Less than 7m from my house.
- 18. Loss of light to windows.
- 19. Loss of local distinctiveness.

VOLUNTARY NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION -

4 Princess Avenue 78 Chain Lane

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

PPS1 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Communities PPG3 Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy HX: Managed LPHX Housing Site Release LPH06 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy H6: Housing developments in the main settlements and villages LPA01 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy A1: Impact on the **Environment and Amenity** LPHD20 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy HD20: Design of New Development and Redevelopment LPR04 Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy R4: Open Space Requirements for New Residential Development Harrogate District Local Plan (2001, as altered 2004) Policy T9: Retention of LPT09

ASSESSMENT OF MAIN ISSUES

Parking

1. POLICY MATTERS - The site is clearly 'previously developed' and is permitted by Policy HX and PPG3.

The site falls within the settlement limits where Policy H6 allows for appropriate infill.

The development is therefore acceptable in 'principle' but the detail matters/appearance discussed below renders the development unacceptable and therefore in conflict with Policies HX and H6.

Being one-bedroomed, there is no requirement under Policy R4 for a commuted sum for open space.

2. APPEARANCE - The general character of the area is one of semi-detached properties with 'gaps' between, often accommodating garages.

The proposed dwelling extends completely up to the boundary, and will appear 'cramped' in the streetscene.

The angled boundary will only add to the cramped appearance and the change in levels and unusual roof design will cause the development to look 'contrived' in the streetscene, contrary to Policies H6, A1 and HD20.

3. AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURS - The building is only 7m from the neighbouring property and to the west and partly elevated.

Whilst the roof is 'hipped' away from the neighbours and unlikely to cut out any direct light, the unbroken expanse of brickwork, some 12.6m long, combined with screen fencing either side, and only 7m from the windows of the adjacent dwellings, will be particularly

oppressive.

The development will dominate the already modest sized rear amenity space of the neighbours.

In addition, the dwelling will create unacceptable living conditions within the existing dwelling with a 3.6m projection down the joint boundary in front of the living room/dining room window and with a screen fence wrapping around in front of that window. The development will be particularly 'unneighbourly' in relation to the surrounding residents.

4. HIGHWAYS AND PARKING - The proposal removes the existing off-street parking facility contrary to Policy T9.

The Highway Officer suggests a condition requiring 3 off-street parking spaces and states:-

"It is difficult to park in this location on Princess Avenue without causing obstruction to residents drives. The site is in close proximity to Chain Lane and therefore there is some concern for additional on-street parking. The above condition is therefore essential. (Please note difficulty caused by difference in levels)."

It would be possible to provide parking on the forecourt of the existing/proposed dwelling (there appears to be 5m from the pavement edge to the front of the dwelling) but the resulting hardstanding would be a harsh treatment and a very "urban" appearance with almost the whole of the front of the dwelling devoted to parking and hardstandings. It would appear detrimental in the streetscene.

CONCLUSION - The proposal attempts to create a dwelling plot on an unusually shaped parcel of land that is inappropriate for such a development and which will adversely afford the neighbours and the appearance of the area.

CASE OFFICER: Mr R Forrester

RECOMMENDATION

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

- The proposed dwelling would appear as an incongerous feature in the streetscene, cramped on the plot, and would be harmful to the character of the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the provisions of Policies HX, H6, A1 and HD20 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.
- The proposal would result in the loss of off-street parking provision in an area of known parking problems, and the resulting displacement of parking would create problems of highway safety. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies T9 and A1 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan. The creation of alternative off-street parking facilities would create a harsh, urban environment that would be harmful to the character of the locality.
- 3 The proposed dwelling by virtue of the expanse of walling close to the boundary

would appear oppressive for neighbouring dwellings on Chain Lane, and the existing dwelling No.2 Princess Avenue both directly in relation to the habitable windows of the dwelling and also whilst residents enjoyed the use of their gardens. The proposal would therefore create conditions that would be harmful to the residential amenity of adjoining residents and result in sub-standard living conditions contrary to the provision of Policies HX, H6, HD20 and A1 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.

