

Philip and Nelly Trevelyan
Sycamore Cottage,
Appleton-le-moors
YO62 6TE



24th July 2016

Dear Hilary Saunders,

Re Application NYM/2016/0463/FL

This is an application for a variation of conditions on permission already granted, and we object to it for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed increased size of the garage development and would be an over-development of an ancillary building.
- 2) We also consider it would amount to an over-development of the site.
- 3) From our garden and yard, the latest proposals would increase the overbearing and dominant nature of the planned development, which in our opinion, is already big enough.
- 4) The new proposals raise the question of whether or not the development can any longer be described as ancillary. The height of its ridge would be just inches lower than the large and recently constructed annex.
- 5) We think the current drawings of the give a false impression. When viewed from the West (or the street view). The eaves of Sycamore Cottage's stone out-building spring from the top of the dividing wall and not from two feet above it. No measurements have been given on the new plans.
- 6) The enlarged development would be seen from the street and out of character in a conservation area.

Comments

The new proposals would be very similar in height to the original proposal for a two story garage and office, *which was rejected by officers.*

The ground level on the Sycamore Cottage side of the 9 ft. dividing wall, is about a metre lower than that of our neighbours, and the original designs proposed that the development would be built on excavated foundations which were level with those of Kirkside Cottage. When officers requested that the original two storey building be amended to a single storey, (on the basis that the development was going to be generally too big), we expected building to start from an excavated foundation. We then noticed that the applicant had amended his plans to a single storey building without any proposal to excavate. This meant that there would be no height reduction and that the new building would continue to be overbearing from our point of view.

Looking at the new drawings of the north elevation it is unclear whether the applicant is planning to excavate (as originally proposed) or not.

If no excavation is proposed and the applicants want the extra height, it looks as if they are reverting to the original plan for a two storey building. The plans are not clear

The newly proposed increase in roof height (with roof lights), suggests that the so-named storage space / garage, might soon be turned into an office. How will this be controlled ?

Meanwhile, we think regular use the building as a garage is unlikely, thanks to the inconvenience of a very narrow entrance.

Yours sincerely,

Philip and Nelly Treve

