

**MINOR UPDATE**

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>DC/17/00610/HHA</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>26 Hollinhill Lockhaugh Rowlands Gill NE39 1AZ</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Two storey side extension and dormer window to rear (amended plans received 03.08.2017)</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Winlaton And High Spen</b>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Grant Permission</b>
<b>Application Type</b>	<b>Householder Application</b>

**Reason for Minor Update****Further representations made**

Two further objections have been received from a resident raising the following concerns:

- That objections (including photographs) were ignored and not part of the Planning Committee presentation, and Planning Committee members were not made sufficiently aware of objections received;
- That objectors consider that the application conflicts with the Council's Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD and that on the site visit on 28 September, Planning Committee members appear to have been mistakenly led to believe that it would not;
- That the proposal would not fully comply with the advice within the Council's Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD and policy DC2 of the UDP, particularly in terms of:
  - overshadowing neighbouring properties,
  - loss of privacy at neighbouring properties,
  - an overbearing and oppressive effect on neighbouring properties, and
  - impact on visual amenity, specifically in reference to the proposed dormer. Dormers in the immediate area are primarily on bungalows and only one two storey property has a rear single dormer, which is incomparable to the 'three storey' effect the proposed dormer would create. At Planning Committee on 13 September, the applicant referred to extensions at the Sherburn Park estate and objectors feel that given the location and size/character of this other estate the comparison should not be used to justify this current proposal.

**A summary of the objections received is available within section 3.0 of the officer's report and copies of the documents (and any other information/details) received as representations are required to be made publicly available by the LPA in any event.**

**It is not usual procedure to formally present images submitted within representations at Planning Committee. In terms of drawings/indicative drawings submitted in representations, there is no certainty as to whether these would accurately portray the proposal. In terms of photographs, photographs were presented that showed the application site and relationships with neighbouring properties.**

**Further, objectors had the opportunity to speak to highlight their concerns at Planning Committee on 13 September and Committee members visited the application site and the neighbouring property at no.24 on 28 September.**

**Whilst a summary of the objections received is provided in the main report, this is expanded below:**

**There is a conservatory and a single storey extension to the garage at the rear of neighbours at no.24. Objections raise particular concern regarding the impact of the proposal in terms of loss of light/overshadowing, loss of privacy, an overbearing and oppressive effect and impact on the visual amenity of the area in relation to the conservatory at no.24.**

**The main report also addresses the proposal's potential impact on residential amenity at paragraphs 5.10 to 5.15. Saved policy DC2 of the UDP and policy CS14 of the CSUCP require that residential amenity is protected. The Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD provides more detailed advice to these policies, and advises that proposed extensions should not dominate neighbouring properties or significantly alter a neighbour's existing level of sunlight, daylight or privacy.**

**As in the main report, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy, or an overbearing impact at neighbouring properties, and would comply with the relevant policies and the Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD in terms of impact on residential amenity.**

**In respect of the proposed dormer, the Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD discourages dormer extensions appearing as more than a small addition to the roof and having a 'top heavy' appearance. It also provides that flat roofed or box dormers will generally be discouraged. Both issues are relevant to the proposal.**

**However, it is considered that the proposal would be typical of a rear elevation in the area and would not result in an unacceptably top heavy**

appearance having an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the locality that would warrant refusal of the application.

Most dormers in the immediate locality are at bungalows (both on rear and principal elevations). There is at least one rear dormer at a two storey property in the local vicinity, at 4 Deneway. Whilst it is acknowledged that this existing dormer is smaller than the dormer proposed in this application at 26 Hollinhill, it is considered that the proposal would not result in the appearance of overdevelopment and would not set an undesirable precedent on this street.

Examples of alterations and extension at the Sherburn Park Estate are not referenced in the officer report and the recommendation is not made on the basis of the appearance of dwellings at this other estate.

Committee members made a site visit on 28 September and were able to view rear elevations at Hollinhill from the rear gardens of the host property no. 26 and the neighbouring property no.24.

As referenced in the main report, there is a strong fall-back position that permitted development rights allow for dormers on dwellinghouses that would not necessarily be considered a small addition.

Therefore, Council officers consider that members of the Committee have sufficient information before them to base a decision.

**SEE MAIN AGENDA FOR OFFICERS REPORT.**