

CYGP1
Design

CYH7
Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Internal
Highway Regulation - No objections

3.2 External
Skelton Parish Council - No objections

3.3 Public Consultation

One letter of objection has been received from the occupier of the adjacent bungalow at No.14: The 2-storey side extension would deprive her kitchen/dining area and bathroom of natural daylight and sunlight. It would also block views of the sky from her kitchen.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 Key Issues
Neighbour amenity;
Visual appearance.

4.2 Neighbour Amenity

The proposal is markedly different from the application that was refused planning permission in 2004. The previous 2-storey side extension would have been located largely on the site of the existing garage. The extension would have extended from almost the front elevation of the house to the rear elevation and would have been less than 0.5m from the boundary with the bungalow at No.14. The footprint of would have been approximately 8.3m by 3.5m. The kitchen window of No.14 faces the application site, across the neighbour's carport. The outlook from the kitchen window would therefore have been dominated by the 2 storey-high, blank side wall of the extension, albeit viewed from under the translucent roof of the carport.

The side extension as currently proposed would lie to the rear of the existing garage so that it would not directly block the outlook from No.14's kitchen window. Moreover, at 7m by 3.3m it would be slightly smaller than previously proposed. Much of the extension would be screened by part of No.14's property, in particular the garage. This part of the house has no windows overlooking the application site. Part of the extension would still be visible from the kitchen and it would partially block views of the sky. However, as the affected window is to a kitchen rather than to a main living room, and as light to, and outlook from, that window is reduced by the objector's own car port, officers consider that the extension would not significantly affect the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The works at the rear of the house, mainly comprising the conservatory, would not be visible from No.14 and would be screened from No.10 by the 3m-high boundary hedge. The impact of these works on the adjacent occupiers would therefore be negligible.

4.3 Visual Appearance

The appearance of the works, whilst being fairly large, would be subservient to the main house and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Materials would match the existing building and the area generally.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 On balance, the proposed development would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to residential and visual amenity. As such, the proposal complies with policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

- 1 TIME2
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans and other submitted details or as may otherwise be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 3 VISQ1
- 4 PD5

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Notes to Applicant

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to impact on the street scene and amenity of neighbours. As such the proposal complies with policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

Contact details:

Author: Kevin O'Connell Development Control Officer
Tel No: 01904 552750