

**Item Number:** 13  
**Application No:** 22/01016/HOUSE  
**Parish:** Pickering Town Council  
**Appn. Type:** Householder Application  
**Applicant:** Mr Graham Bateman  
**Proposal:** Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey part side part rear extension  
**Location:** Dunrobin 14 Beacon Park First Avenue Pickering North Yorkshire YO18 8AQ

**Registration Date:** 7 September 2022  
**8/13 Wk Expiry Date:** 2 November 2022  
**Overall Expiry Date:** 12 December 2022  
**Case Officer:** Ellie Thompson **Ext:** 43326

#### **CONSULTATIONS:**

<b>Pickering Town Council</b>	No Objections
<b>Highways North Yorkshire</b>	No Objections
<b>Pickering Town Council</b>	No Objections
<b>Highways North Yorkshire</b>	No Objections

**Representations:** Mr & Mrs Harper, Mrs Pauline Jeffrey, Mr Derek And E.A Lawson, Mrs Christine Marshall,

---

#### **SITE:**

The property is a 20<sup>th</sup> century, semi-detached, two-storey dwelling, located on Beacon Park First Avenue in Pickering. The site is located within the Pickering development limit, and within the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value.

The property is constructed from red brick under a red tile roof, and features traditional fenestration detailing. The site occupies a long, narrow plot.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

This application originally sought permission for the erection of a part-rear, part-side two storey extension following the demolition of the existing garage, and to alter the existing roof form of the main dwelling from a hipped roof to a pitched roof.

Four objections were received from occupiers of neighbouring properties, in relation to the original proposed development, raising issues relating to design, scale, and impact on the street-scene and the character and appearance of the area. Officer's raised concerns with the applicant over the design and scale of the proposed development, and the alteration of the roof form from a hipped roof to a pitched roof form and its impact on the character and appearance of the street-scene. Following this the application was revised. A re-consultation was undertaken and a new site notice was posted at the site.

## **PROPOSAL:**

The application now seeks permission for the erection of a single storey part side part rear extension, following the demolition of the existing garage.

The new extension is proposed to have a part hipped, part flat-roof form. The hipped roof section of the extension is proposed to extend out and run parallel to the southern boundary of the site, but will be situated approximately 1 metre away from this boundary to maintain a side access to the rear garden. The flat roof section of the extension is proposed to be situated to the rear of the existing dwelling, between the hipped-roof section and the northern boundary of the site.

The extension is proposed to be constructed from red brick under a rosemary clary tile roof, and will feature flush casement windows. The overall ridge height of the extension will be approximately 4.7 metres, with an eaves height of approximately 2.9 metres. The overall height of the flat-roofed section of the extension will be approximately 3 metres. The overall footprint of the entire extension is proposed to be approximately 61.1 square metres.

## **PLANNING HISTORY:**

There is no relevant planning history for this application.

## **POLICIES:**

Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 planning authorities are required to determine each planning application in accordance with the planning policies that comprise the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant Development Plan policies for the determination of this application are:

### The Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy (2013)

Local Plan Strategy – Policy SP16 Design

Local Plan Strategy - Policy SP20 Generic Development Management Issues

### Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

## **REPRESENTATIONS:**

A brief summary of the position of statutory and non-statutory consultees is included on the front sheet of the report and issues raised are addressed in the relevant appraisal sections of the report. All consultation responses are available for Members to view in full on the public access webpage, and referred to in the report accordingly.

In relation to the original proposed development for a two-storey part-rear, part-side extension, 5 letters of objection were received from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. These comments are summarised below:

- Scale poses a significant change to the appearance of the property and impacts both neighbouring properties. Proposed development would engulf the existing dwelling and adversely affect the appearance of the property.

- Alteration of hipped-roof to a pitched roof alters the character and appearance of the property, the pair of semis and the area/other pairs of semis, and would have a negative impact on the streetscene. This may set a precedent for other properties.
- Two storey extension on driveway would look out of place, and deprive future occupants of a garage.
- Loss of light/Overshadowing of neighbours.
- Water overflow and snow overspill onto neighbouring extension to the north
- The height, length and proximity of the extension would overwhelm and dominate no. 12.

Pickering Town Council was consulted on the application and raised no objections to the proposal. The Local Highway Authority was also consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposed development.

Following the revision of the proposed development to a single-storey extension, a full re-consultation was undertaken. In relation to the revised scheme which is currently proposed, 1 letter of objection has been received from the occupier of the immediate neighbouring property to the south (No.12). These comments are summarised below:

- Revised proposal does not fully address comments made in relation to previous proposal.
- Beacon Park features double width driveways between various houses which gives a sense of space and privacy. The current arrangement at no.14 (existing garage) has a similar effect to a 2m high fence and daylight can be achieved over the top of it.
- Scale: Proposed extension is too large and will double the size of the ground floor.
- Design: Character of the host building will be lost altogether by the scale of the extension, and it will no longer sit comfortably within its surroundings. It will look like a bungalow has been added to the rear of the dwelling, which will look out of place and out of character.
- No.12 was built further back from the street within its plot so as to not overlook or be overlooked by immediate neighbours (no.14 and no.10). The revised proposed plans will increase the footprint alongside no. 12, and ensure daylight no longer reaches no.12's hallway.
- The height of the proposal would have the same effect as moving the existing garage to within less than 1 metre of no. 12.
- Overbearing: No.12 is a dormer bungalow design and the proposed scale and proximity of the new structure would have an overbearing presence on no. 12.

One letter of objection to the original proposed scheme (two-storey extension) was received from the occupier of no.17 Beacon Park First Avenue, after the re-consultation for the revised proposal had begun. The Case Officer contacted this neighbour to clarify which proposal they were concerned about, and they confirmed that their concerns were in relation to the initial, original proposed development (two-storey extension). However, they also stated that while the revised proposed development was an improvement, they did have concerns that the proposal could potentially be extended upwards to first floor level in the future, which would not be acceptable. However, they confirmed that as long as the development remained single-storey they did not have any objections to the proposed development (single-storey extension).

Pickering Town Council have been consulted on the revised proposal, and have confirmed they have no objections to the proposed development. The Local Highway Authority was also consulted on the revised application and confirmed their previous response (no objections) was still appropriate

## **APPRAISAL:**

The main issues relating to this application are:

- Design, Form, Character and Heritage
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Other Issues – Fall-Back Position, Future Development and Highway Safety

### Design, Form, Character and Heritage

The application site is a semi-detached property, within a street-scene predominantly made up of semi-detached, post-war dwellings. As such there is a strong pattern of development and character within the area. However, the property immediately to the south of the application site is one of the few exceptions to this pattern of development, as it is a dormer bungalow style dwelling which has been set back within its. As a result, the side (southern) elevation of the application property is highly visible within the street-scene, across the front garden amenity space of the neighbouring property to the south.

The proposed part rear, part side extension is proposed to be made up of two forms. The section to the rear of the existing dwelling will have a flat-roof, block form which will extend out from the rear of the dwelling by approximately 5 metres. While the proposed form does not reflect the existing pitched roof form of the host dwelling, it is considered that it is of a simple design, which will have a modern and unobtrusive appearance.

The southern section of the extension, which extends around the southern (side) elevation of the property, is proposed to have a hipped roof form. This section of the extension extends out from the rear of the dwelling by approximately 8.6 metres; however as this part of the extension wraps around the side of the dwelling, its full depth along the southern boundary is approximately 11 metres. The proposed roof form reflects the form, pitch and style of the form of the host dwelling, and is considered to be appropriate on this section of the extension, which will be clearly visible from within the street scene.

The proposed extension is large in scale; in terms of floor area the new extension will be approximately 4 metres larger than the footprint of the existing dwelling. However, the majority of the massing of the extension will be situated to the rear of the property, and it is not considered that it will engulf or detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The addition of the hipped roof form to the southern section of the extension does result in quite a tall form for a single-storey extension; however, the extension is subservient in height to the host dwelling, and it is considered that the hipped roof form has a neat appearance which reflects the character of the host dwelling and the wider street-scene. In addition, the proposed use of materials to match the existing dwelling is considered to be appropriate.

On this basis the proposed extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of design, and is considered to comply with policy SP16 (Design) of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.

### Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The new extension is proposed to be sited to the rear and side of the property, in an area which is currently occupied by a detached garage structure, and existing lean-to rear extension and a patio area.

The flat roof section of the extension will be situated at the northern side of the site, between the hipped roof section of the extension, the attached neighbouring property's existing rear extension and the northern boundary fence. The extension will extend approximately 1.6 metres further along the neighbouring boundary, beyond the end of the neighbouring extension. While this would result in an increase in the built mass along this shared boundary, due to the small scale and unobtrusive form of the new extension it is not considered that this will result in a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the attached neighbouring property to the north, in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or overbearing effects.

An objection has been received in relation to the potential loss of light from a hallway, bathroom and WC windows in the side elevation of the neighbouring property to the south, as a result of the scale and dimensions of the rear extension, and its proximity to the shared (southern) boundary. The boundary between the two properties consist of a low timber fence, however the existing garage and outbuildings within the application site are built hard-up against this boundary, and therefore reinforce the boundary in this location. The existing garage has a very low, mono-pitched roof, measuring approximately 2.7 metres at its western end, and 2.3 metres at its eastern end.

The neighbouring property is a dormer-style bungalow dwelling, and features windows and doors within the side elevation facing towards the application site. There is a side access between the side elevation of the neighbouring property and the boundary with the application site. It is understood that the ground floor windows in the side elevation are obscure glazed, and serve a bathroom, a WC, a hallway area; with a first floor window which serves a landing area. Due to the scale of the extension, it is considered that there may be a slight reduction in the levels of daylight experienced within these spaces. However, these are not considered to be primary living spaces, and due to the proximity of the existing garage structure and other ancillary outbuildings within the application site, are already relatively overshadowed. It is not considered that the proposed new extension would result in a significant level of loss of daylight, over and above what is currently experienced at the site. Furthermore, while the extension will be a tall structure, due to the intervening side access space and the lack of primary living spaces on the northern side of the neighbouring property it is not considered that the proposed development will result in a significant detrimental overbearing impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

The proposed development will be set in from the neighbouring boundary by approximately 1 metre, and the highest point of this part of the extension will be set in by approximately 2.6 metres from the boundary. However, the proposed extension will result in an increase in the built massing of the property in close proximity to the shared boundary with the neighbour. However, the application site is located to the north of this neighbouring property, and as a result it is not anticipated that the proposed development would block significant levels of sunlight from these openings, due to the orientation of the properties and the movement of the sun across the day. Taking into account the orientation of the properties, the existing structures along the boundary and the space between the proposed rear extension and the neighbouring windows, it is not considered that the proposed development will result in a significant, detrimental loss of light for the occupiers of the neighbouring property, over and above what is currently experienced at the site.

One of the ground floor windows in the southern elevation of the proposed extension is proposed to serve an en-suite, and would be facing the neighbouring property to the south. There are two windows on the neighbouring property which serve a WC and bathroom space, which are obscure glazed and would be opposite the proposed new en-suite window. However, it is understood that there is no planning control over the windows within the neighbouring property, and therefore they could be replaced with clear glazing in the future. As such there is some potential for some intervisibility of these internal spaces between these two properties, and it is considered appropriate to recommend a condition for the new en-suite window to be obscure glazed, in order to protect the privacy of both the occupiers of the neighbouring property, and the occupiers of the application property.

The proposed development is not considered to result in a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity, in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or overbearing effects, over and above what is currently experienced at the site. On this basis it is considered that the proposed development complies with Policy SP20 (Generic Development Management Issues) of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.

#### Other Issues – Fall-Back Position and Future Development

It is also noted that a single-storey rear extension could be achieved at this property up to an overall height of 4 metres under permitted development rights, providing it was constructed from matching materials and extended no further than 3 metres out from the rear of the existing dwelling. The

proposed new extension is larger than this, and extends around the side of the dwelling so could not be achieved under permitted development. However, it is acknowledged that an increase in the massing to the rear of the property could be achieved, approximately 3 metres from the neighbouring boundary to the south, without the need for planning permission.

Some concerns have been raised in relation to the potential for the extension to be extended upwards in the future. A first floor extension is not sought under this current application, and as such has not been considered as part of this process. A first floor extension above the proposed single storey part-side, part-rear extension would require planning permission in its own right, and as such any future proposed first floor extension would require and be subject to a new, separate planning application.

The proposed development wraps around the side elevation of the host dwelling, and would encroach into the driveway space. However the property benefits from a long driveway, which will provide an acceptable level of parking provision for the property. The Local Highway Authority has been consulted on the application and has confirmed they have no objections to the proposed development.

Conclusion:

The proposed development is considered to comply with the relevant Policy criteria set out in policies SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and the NPPF. On this basis approval is recommended subject to the following conditions:

**RECOMMENDATION:                      Approval**

- 1            The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before .  
  
Reason: To ensure compliance with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
  
- 2            The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s):  
  
Site Location Plan (scanned to file on 23.09.2022)  
Proposed Elevation and Floor Plans, drwg. no. GB-001-05 Rev C, (scanned to file on 18.11.2022)  
  
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning in accordance with Policies SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.
  
- 3            The materials of the development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the details included in the Planning Application Form (scanned to file on 23.09.2022) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
  
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP16 and SP20 of the Local Plan Strategy.
  
- 4            Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the en-suite window in the southern (side) elevation of the development hereby approved shall be obscured to the highest level of obscuration (Pilkington Glass Level 5 or equivalent), and retained as such for the life time of the development.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupiers of the application site and adjoining neighbouring properties, and to comply with Policy SP20 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy.