

ADDENDUM

Item No: 6

Application No:	15/01956/FULH	Author	Rachael Watts
Date valid:	7 December 2015	☎:	0191 643 6311
Target decision date:	1 February 2016	Ward:	Benton

Application type: Householder Full application

Location: 33 Forest Avenue Forest Hall NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE NE12 9AH

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension to provide new accessible bedroom on ground floor and replacement lounge area

Applicant: Dr Christopher Hartworth, 33 Forest Avenue Forest Hall
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE NE12 9AH

Agent: Mr Aidan Jackson, FAO Mr Aidan Jackson 14 Denewood Forest Hall
Newcastle Upon Tyne NE12 7FA

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

The residents of No. 31 have submitted an additional representation:

1 Ref 2.2, the existing extension does not project as shown on the plans and is actually 1.67m beyond our rear elevation not 1.4m.

2 8.2 DCPS No 9 – states 'normally' be restricted to a maximum of 2.4m. Whilst we accept this application will be assessed on merits, the proposed plans would make the total of both extensions approximately 5 metres. This is extremely difficult to establish as there are no dimensions given for the new proposal. However it will clearly impact on our light – as the existing extension already does.

3 8.4 We have lost light from one window already and installed a rooflight to compensate this – the roof structure does not allow us to do anything further. The proposed extension will take the light from our remaining main window, leaving only the roof light to provide adequate natural light. We would like our opinion stated clearly alongside that of the Officer.

4 8.7 'Right to Light' assessment. Whilst we accept this is not policy, this should be considered. To re-iterate we will lose light from the main window in our kitchen/dining area and we believe this to be unacceptable as we have clearly demonstrated in our submissions.

5 9.5 We consider the proposal to be totally out of proportion with regards to the original building and the adjacent properties.

6 10.11 We query that appropriate consultation has taken place for this application, we do not believe this to be the case. The only document we received was the letter advising that the application had been submitted.

6 10.14 The figures are incorrect as shown in point 1, ref 2.2. Our concern is that if members disregard the blatant over building to the previous extension, we could be in a similar situation, particularly as there are no dimensions on the submitted documents.