

ADDENDUM 08.03.16

Item No: 5

Application No: 15/01910/FULH Author: Rachael Watts
Date valid: 11 December 2015 ☎: 0191 643 6311
Target decision date: 5 February 2016 Ward: Preston

Application type: Householder Full 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

E-mail sent to Cllr Mulvenna and Cllr Lott from the owner of 16 Camp Terrace

I am the owner of 16 Camp Terrace, the property immediately to the east of the proposed second storey extension. In your capacity as Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, I wish to bring to your attention a number of very significant and material errors and discrepancies in the report 15/01910/FULH the Committee is considering on Tuesday.

Some of the report you are considering is based on measurements, data and information emanating from revised drawings (published by the Council on the 25th of February) and associated documents, published at roughly the same time. When I looked at the revised drawings and the Planning Committee report, a number of issues didn't "look/ feel right" to me. These issues were so concerning to me that I simultaneously sought clarification from the planning officer, and commissioned a Chartered Building Surveyor to look at and comment on the revised plans and associated documents. The building surveyor submitted his report to me yesterday. After reading through the responses from the planning officer and the building surveyor's report, the main significant errors and discrepancies still remaining in the report are:

1) Agenda item 5.5, point 8.14 page 103 states that *"it is officer advice that the impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents, with particular regards to loss of light, outlook and privacy is acceptable"*.

One of the major factors that will influence the amount of loss of light, outlook and privacy is the ridge height of the roof on the second storey extension.

The planning officer advised me via e mail that:
"I have measured up the plans and the ridge height of the proposed two storey extension would measure approximately 1.5m above the existing rain water goods. (0.8m below the existing roof height of the property)."

The building surveyor advised me in his written report:
"The proposed ridge line is indeed 1.5 metres higher than the gutter line of the original property, however, the ridge is not 0.8 metres lower than the original ridge"

line as the planners state. The drawings show the proposed ridge line to be approximately 1.4 metres below the original ridge line. You should ask the planners to clarify this as allowing the proposed ridge to be constructed higher would have a greater detrimental affect on loss of light and outlook"

The building surveyor is saying that one of the measurements supplied by the planning officer is significantly incorrect. Surely it needs to be established which is the incorrect measurement before a correct judgement on the acceptability or otherwise can be made in respect of loss of light, outlook, privacy and how overbearing the development will be?

2) Agenda item 5.5, point 8.22 page 104 states "*In addition to the policies outlined above, the Camp Terrace Character Appraisal was adopted in 2006*".

Why is the original version of the Camp Terrace Conservation Area Character Appraisal being applied, when it was superceded by a revised version in 2011?

3) Agenda item 5.5, point 7.6 page 109 states "*The ground floor area of the extension will equate to 12% of the ground floor space*".

The building surveyor advised me in his written report "*The additional ground floor area from the proposed extension is 25%, not 12% as stated by the planning department*".

I request that the correct percentage increase in ground floor area be established before a decision is made, as Committee members might well view a 25% increase much differently from a 12% increase.

4) A corollary of the concerns I've raised in points 1 and 3 above is whether the measurements and angles on the plans submitted by the applicant have been checked by Planning Department, and are accurate and to scale. I sought Planning Department clarification on these issues. The officer's comments in the addendum stating "*It is considered that the proposed plans are to scale...*" don't give me much reassurance on this matter. If the plans are to scale, and the measurements and angles have been checked by Planning Department, is it not a simple matter of saying so?

5) The building surveyor stated in his written report to me; "*The ground floor extension encroaches past the 45 degree line taken from the nearest habitable room window (No. 18's lounge)*".

Number 18 is the property immediately to the west of the applicant's property. I don't understand the technical implications of what the surveyor is saying, but he seems to be suggesting that some planning guidelines, regulations or policies are either being contravened or are not being adhered to in the revised plans.

Officer advice:

- Amended plans were received on Monday 7th March to correct discrepancies in the plans.

- Paragraph 8.22 of the officer report refers to the Camp Terrace Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2006. For clarification, the current Camp Terrace Conservation Area Character Appraisal was published in 2011.

