

ADDENDUM

Item No: 5.5

Application No: 15/01910/FULH Author Rachael Watts
Date valid: 11 December 2015 ☎:0191 634 6311
Target decision date: 5 February 2016 Ward: Preston

Application type: full planning application

Location: 17 Camp Terrace North Shields Tyne And Wear NE29 0NE
Proposal: Two storey and single storey rear extension

Applicant: Mrs Lucy Thompson, 17 Camp Terrace North Shields Tyne And Wear NE29 0NE

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

Additional Information

Members should note that an additional letter of objection was received following amended plans from no. 15 and 16 Camp Terrace setting out concerns about the impact of the new extension and stating that planning permission should not be granted:

-There has been no other application permitted for two storey rear extensions on terraced houses over the past 5 year period in Preston Ward or Camp Terrace Conservation Area.

- The height of the second storey extension will be between 140 and 150% higher than any ground floor extension in the vicinity. It will also be 1.5 metres higher than the existing rainwater goods on the existing two storey building and only 0.8 metres below the existing roofline.

-Using the last 2 measurements of 1.5 metres and 0.8 metres, the pitched roof in the proposed north elevation in the revised floor plans and elevations posted on the online portal on 25th February appears not to be to scale. It is our view that the top of the pitched roof should be much higher than shown. If this is the case, then the second storey extension would cast a bigger shadow on our windows than the plans suggest.

- Our concerns about the height of the second storey extension are exacerbated by the first sentence in section 8.25 of the report to be considered by the Planning Committee, which says "The roof of the proposed extension will be visible from the rear lane". If the roof can be visible from the northernmost part of the rear lane behind number 17 (3.8 metres away from the rear wall of number 17) and over number 17's rear wall (a height of 2.7 metres), then we would suggest that its height is a major concern;

-We take issue with a number of points in the document submitted by the applicant in section 7.6 of appendix 1:

a) "They (i.e. the applicant) have designed an extension which is thought to be sympathetic to neighbours";

b) "Number 16's light would only be affected by a small percentage in the evening";

Both of the above are assumptions made by the applicant. He didn't consult with anyone prior to submitting the plans and has not visited us to consider the impact of light his proposal will have on number 16;

c) "There are other examples of two storey rear extensions on Queen Alexandra Road";

Yes there are other examples; however they are mainly flat roofed rather than pitched roofs, were built 30 or 40 years ago, and are outside the boundary of the Conservation Area; and

d) "Prior to submission the proposed extension was reduced in size in order to lessen any impact". Where is the evidence to support this assertion?

-Although we were completely unaware of the proposal for a second storey extension until the applicant put a note through our door on 23rd December (24 days after it was received by the Council), we still support the application for a single storey extension only.

-Concerns regarding amended plans and whether the old plans are still available to view on the planning portal.

-Unfair bias due to refusal of speaking request

- The applicant's response states that no.15 would not be affected by the proposal in inaccurate and misleading.

-The applicant's revised photo in section 1 (East) shows the distant assumed extension of No 12 which is actually the flank wall of the original building and around 6 metres not 8+ as claimed.

-Lack of consultation from applicant has lead to inaccuracies and plans are misleading.

-The photo in section 2 (West) within the submitted document from the applicant actually reinforces our objection as the proposed extension will completely obliterate this view and block the sunlight from our kitchen patio around early afternoon onwards.

-Officer recommendation report does not detail the Council's 'living in a conservation area guide to residents' document.

-A query was also made as to whether no.15 have the right of reply and whether it would be included in the Committee documents.

Officer Comments

- All planning applications are assessed on individual merit. In this instance the two storey extension has been deemed acceptable by planning officers.
- The scale, height and mass of the extensions have been assessed within the recommendation report.
- Issues raised with regards to light and outlook are also discussed in detail within the report.
- It is considered that the proposed plans are to scale and any development must be in accordance with the approved plans.
- It is noted that there are two storey rear extensions on Alexandra Road. As outlined in DCPS no. 9 'rear extensions' states 'The use of flat roofs should be avoided where possible for design and maintenance reasons'. Whilst Alexandra Road is outside the Conservation Area the examples are still visible from Camp Terrace. The Conservation Officer has been consulted on this application and supports the application, subject to conditions.
- Prior to submission the applicant sought pre-application advice from the LPA. It was officer advice to reduce the initially proposed projections and to construct a hipped roof rather than a gable roof in order to reduce the bulk of the extension.
- The applicant is able to submit revised drawings. The Local Planning Authority would only re-consult if the amendments were significant enough or of greater impact. The revised drawing set the extension further back from the shared boundary and is considered to be of a lesser impact. The applicant has submitted these plans and, if approved construction must be in accordance with approved plans. The superseded plans remain available online.
- It is council policy that speaking requests on householder applications would not usually be permitted. The applicant also not been given the right to speak.

The officer recommendation, to approve the application, remains unchanged.