### **COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Committee:** East Area **Ward:** Skelton, Rawcliffe, Clifton

Without

Date: 14 September 2006 Parish: Skelton Parish Council

**Reference:** 06/01398/FUL

**Application at:** 12 Grange Close Skelton York YO30 1YR

**For:** Two storey pitched roof side extension and single storey rear

extension.

By: Mr Hutchinson
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 28 August 2006

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application property is a 2-storey, detached house with an attached, flat-roofed garage to which a flat-roofed utility room has been added to the rear. The house has a single-storey, 1m-deep, flat-roofed projection to the rear. The rear garden is well-screened by a 3m-high hedge along all boundaries. The adjacent property (No.14) is a bungalow with a polycarbonate carport up to the shared boundary. The window of the kitchen/dining area of No.14 faces the carport and the application site beyond.
- 1.2 Permission is sought to demolish the utility room and replace it with a large two storey side extension up to the side boundary. The existing garage would be retained. At the rear the existing rear projection would be given a lean-to roof and an L-shaped conservatory would be added.
- 1.3 The application cannot be determined under delegated powers as the applicant is an employee of this Council.
- 1.4 Planning permission for a 2-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and conservatory was refused by committee on 9 September 2004 due to the loss of light to the adjacent bungalow at No.14 Grange Close.

### 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

2.2 Policies:

Application Reference Number: 06/01398/FUL Item No: 4c)

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.

Application Reference Number: 06/01398/FUL Item No: 4c)

Page 2 of 3

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