

ADDENDUM (03.03.2016)

Item No: 5.1

Application No:	15/01958/FUL	Author	Julia Crebbin
Date valid:	21 December 2015	:	
Target decision date:	15 February 2016	☎:	0191 643 6314
		Ward:	St Marys

Application type: full planning application

Location: West Farm 44 Front Street Earsdon Whitley Bay Tyne And Wear NE25 9JT

Proposal: Refurbishment of existing farmhouse and farm buildings, with associated demolition and two storey and single storey new build extensions, in order to provide 6no. new dwellings

Applicant: Monument Ltd., FAO Mr Andrew Richardson 68 Clayton Park Square Jesmond Newcastle Upon Tyne NE2 4DP

Agent: Miller Partnership Architects Ltd, Miss Jane Miller Miller Partnership Architects 101 Ouseburn Road Newcastle Upon Tyne Tyne And Wear NE6 5AF

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

Revised Plans

Revised plans have been submitted, the revisions are as follows:

- Installation of roof lights to properties two, three, four and six.
- Revision to car port in property 6 (timber boarded gable).

Additional Representations

1no. objection has been submitted, this is set summarised below:

- Patio section of the garden of No.40 Front Street, which is on substantially lower ground than the new courtyard dwelling, will be overlooked as a result of the roof light to the first floor room.

Further comments have been submitted by the occupiers of No.42 Front Street, summarised below:

- Would it be possible to raise the height of the boundary wall between site and No.42 to 2m as people may be able to see over 1.8m. Also, could you make it a condition that the work is carried out at the beginning of the project or make it a condition that some sort of screening is put in place?
- Could the existing fencing on the north wall (between No.42 and application site) be replaced with something more attractive and extend it along or alternatively could the developers erect fencing on their side.
- We feel section 9.9 of the report is incorrect as we have no concerns about

the appearance of the gable end. It is the proposal to extend the barn up to the boundary wall that we object to as we feel it is not essential to the development when it is not designed to provide habitable accommodation, merely cover for two cars. We feel the work it entails puts our tree at unnecessary risk.

- A bedroom window to the Stables dwelling will overlook our land. Another reason to have the west wall raised to 2m but also could the retention of the timber slats on that window be conditioned?

Case Officer Comments

The applicant has confirmed that the lower edge of the roof light to the bathroom in Property 6 facing 42 Front Street is 2130mm above finished floor level, so it would not be possible to overlook the adjacent property if the window was open. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to ensure that this window is opaque glazed. The boundary wall condition has been revised to reflect the request 2m height, and a new condition has been suggested to ensure that the boundary treatment along No.42's northern boundary is agreed prior to occupation of the dwellings. The eastern facing first floor window in property 6 (the stables) will look towards the rear garden of No.42 at a distance of at least 15m to the boundary. The distance to the rear elevation of No.42 will be at least 29m at an oblique angle. Due to these separation distances it is not considered reasonable or necessary to condition the retention of the wooden slats to this bedroom window.

Revised Conditions:

Condition No.1

The development to which the permission relates shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following plans and specifications:

Drawing No. A00 - Site Location Plan – Dec 2015

Drawing No.B01 – Rev b - Proposed Ground Floor Plans & Site Plan - Nov 2015

Drawing No.B02 - Rev b - Proposed First Floor Plans & Site Plan - Nov 2015

Drawing No.B03 – Rev b - Proposed Roof Plans - Nov 2015

Drawing No.B04 – Rev b – Proposed Elevations – Dec 2015

Drawing No.B05 – Rev b – Proposed Elevations – Dec 2015

Drawing No.B06 – Rev b - Proposed Elevations – Dec 2015

Drawing No.B07 – Rev b - Proposed Elevations – Dec 2015

Drawing No.B08 – Rev c – Proposed Elevations – Dec 2015

Risk Assessment & Bat Survey, Prepared by Stuart Johnson Sc MSc MCIEEM Consultant Ecologist, 23/11/2015

Arboricultural Survey, Prepared by Stuart Johnson BSc MSc MCIEEM Consultant Ecologist, 8/12/2015

Phase 1: Desk Top Study Report and Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report, arc environmental, 9/10/2015

Reason: To ensure that the development as carried out does not vary from the approved plans.

Condition No.26

Prior to occupation of any part of the approved development full details of how

the boundary wall between the application site and No.42 shall be raised to a height of 2m from the ground floor level of the application adjacent to this boundary shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The details shall include a site plan showing the extent of the wall in question, elevational drawings of the proposed wall and full specifications of materials and finishes. The wall shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupants of No.42 Front Street in accordance with policy H11 of the UDP.

Additional Condition

Condition No.32

Property 6 shall not be occupied until full details of the boundary treatment to be located along the shared boundary between the application site and No.42 Front Street has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved fence or wall shall then be installed prior to first occupation of this dwelling and thereafter retained at the height and position as approved.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties, and the occupiers of the properties the subject of this permission having regard to policy H11 of the North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan 2002.