

Members Update Sheet

Item 1 **NYM/2018/0310/FL**

Please note the additional condition as follows:

- 28. GAC00** Prior to the commencement of works on site a detailed slope stability report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The development shall then be carried out in strict accordance with the approved scheme.

Please note the amendments to the following conditions:

- 2. PLAN02** **Strict Accordance With the Documentation Submitted or Minor Variations - Document No's Specified**
- 16. MATS60** All new traditional sized window frames, glazing bars, external doors and door frames shall be of timber construction and the larger full height windows and doors shall be constructed of a dark painted metal. All windows and doors shall be maintained in that condition in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Item 2 **NYM/2018/0827/FL**

Additional Parish Council Comments:

At a full meeting held on the 13 February 2019, members of the Danby Group Parish Council carefully and at length considered the planning application NYM/2018/0827/FL in respect of Ainthorpe House, 1 Brook Lane, Ainthorpe.

The Parish Council previous considered an application in respect of this address which had been very similarly worded but had included reference to the land being used for an "occasional community events hub".

In respect of that application members resolved to object to the 'development' on the basis that the proposed so called 'community hub' use was deemed to be inappropriate / incompatible in this location and both unfair and an inconvenience to neighbours. The actual building proposed, which has already been erected (hence the retrospective nature of the application) was not seen as a major issue.

Amended details in respect of this matter have now been submitted by the applicant / his agent and reference to the community events hub has been omitted from the application. Members of the Parish Council expressed certain reticence in respect of the manner in which planning applications at this address were being made. Members were cognisant of the fact that there is an apparent lack of regard of planning regulations evidenced by the fact that there is a history of retrospective applications being made. Mention was also made / concerns raised in respect of the identically worded letters which had been submitted in support of the application as it stood previously.

Again the building subject of the application (which is already in use) is not the issue but queries were raised as to the reasons behind the change of use aspect of the application now being made.

The actual nature of the land subject of the application i.e. the land on which the office / tractor shed is sited will not change, it is a grassed area. Why therefore is there a need to have it classified as a domestic garden rather than being agricultural land? In respect of a domestic garden (as opposed to agricultural land) are planning regulations less stringent with regards building construction and / or how the land is used?

Purely on a planning basis, members of the Parish Council resolved not to object to the application but agreed the concerns raised during their debate should be brought to the notice of the NYMNPA Planning Committee.

Item 3 NYM/2018/0324/FL

The application has been withdrawn from the Agenda for further negotiations

Item 4 NYM/2018/0720/FL

Please note a revised recommendation as follows:

Approval subject to the expiration of the re-consultation period and the following conditions:

Please note the amendments to the following condition:

3. **GASC07** The development hereby approved shall be rendered in a texture to match that of the original building within 3 months of the completion of the structural building works. The rendering shall then be painted with Sandtex Ultra Smooth Masonry Paint in 'Mid Stone' no later than one month after the extension is first brought into use. The finish shall be maintained in that condition in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Natural England – No comment

Comments in Relation to the Amended Plans:

Parish Council – Resolved to object on the following seven grounds:

- Overdevelopment
- Too High - single storey more or less same height as main house
- Detrimental effect on neighbour
- Close to neighbour's boundary
- Overshadowing neighbour
- Doesn't comply with design guides

During the conversation on the above, concerns were raised regarding width of extension, and that the height of the ridge line was possibly because of potential to create extra rooms in the roof void with associated velux windows in the future. They could not see why the development had to be so big and indeed the garage could be reduced in height and stepped back at least a metre.

P & S Brady – Little Orchard, Back Lane, Sicklinghall, Wetherby – Owner of Rose Cottage, 2 Egton Road, Aislaby

Whilst acknowledging that there is an improvement with a single storey instead of a two storey extension, I still have concerns relating to the impact it will have and these are detailed below:

- Still represents overdevelopment and results in a ‘terrace effect’
- Although now single storey, the height on the rear elevation has been significantly increased both width and height, with the roof line now situated immediately below the bedroom windows. The increase in size of this element will have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties, especially in view of the close proximity of the respective boundaries
- The garage roof appears to be excessively high with the ridge situated immediately below the eaves of the existing house
- The revised extension is still over dominant because of its height and scale

P Dowson – 58 Main Road, Aislaby

I note the reduction to a single storey extension; however the ridge of the proposed single storey appears excessively high being almost up to the eaves of the main house. This will result in a loss of open space between properties and will greatly overshadow the carefully restored cottage opposite. The rear extension has been increased significantly in height with the roof now extending to just below the bedroom/bathroom windows. This will have a significant impact on the neighbouring properties to either side.

G Noel Barratt LLB (Hons) Lawyer on behalf of Mr & Mrs G Henderson, 78 Main Road, Aislaby

We object to the amended application on grounds of scale, size and situation.

Whilst the extension at the side has purportedly been “reduced” in height from a two storey to single storey extension a close inspection of the plans reveals that in fact that the walls of the proposed amended rear extension at ground floor level have been increased in height by approximately 701mm and the ridge height of the proposed amendment side extension actually still stands as high as the eaves level of the original house, which has done little to reduce the blocking effect in regard to the street scene.

Why has the ground floor height been raised by 400mm. Why has the side extension got a high pitch instead of having a much lower height to wall plate and a more traditional “leanto” pantile roof to the side of the existing house is somewhat of a mystery, as such a design would have ameliorated to some extent the blocking effect of the side extension.

Our clients are concerned that the height is such that the applicant may be able to use some of the roof void over the side extension at first floor level. There will be a 1.5m drop in levels between our client’s land and the proposed ground level.

There is now a gap of approx. 840mm between the applicant’s property and the neighbour’s boundary fence this is still going to be extremely tight to enable a suitable structural wall to be built to retain the higher ground and our client’s house.

The size of the single storey extension to the rear has been increased in footprint and height. The increased roof height gives a rather ugly appearance.

Additional Background Information:

The agent has submitted a block plan which has been amended to show the neighbouring property.

Please see separate circulated information received from Brian and Sophie Senior in support of the application

Item 6 NYM/2018/0835/OU

The application has been withdrawn from the Agenda to enable Officers to seek an independent agricultural appraisal.

Item 7 NYM/2018/0730/FL

Parish Council – The Parish Council's original objection still stands. The Parish Council are aware of the amendments made but believe that they don't address the original concerns.

Item 8 NYM/2019/0070/FL

Please note the amendments to the following conditions:

5. **DRGE00** The amenity block hereby approved shall not be used until the associated foul sewerage tank has been commissioned for use and thereafter it shall not be used unless the tank is maintained and is fully operating.

7. **LNDS00** Prior to the development being first brought into use, the soft landscape works outlined in the applicant's email dated 27 February shall be carried out and thereafter be maintained to standard field boundary height once established. This planting shall include reinforcing and new hedge planting along the west and south site boundaries to match the species and density along the northern and eastern boundaries.

Item 9 NYM/2018/0542/FL

The application has been withdrawn from the Agenda for further consideration in respect of the impact on the Listed Building.

Item 10 NYM/2018/0544/LB

The application has been withdrawn from the Agenda for further consideration in respect of the impact on the Listed Building.