

Committee Report

Application No:	DC/18/00248/HHA
Case Officer	Josh Woollard
Date Application Valid	15 March 2018
Applicant	Mr Jon Hunt
Site:	43 Hillcrest Drive Dunston Hill Gateshead NE11 9QS
Ward:	Dunston Hill And Whickham East
Proposal:	Retrospective rear balcony
Recommendation:	REFUSE
Application Type	Householder Application

1.0 The Application:

1.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.2 The application site is a two-storey, detached property with a single storey red-brick rear extension that spans the length of the rear elevation. The site sits at the end of Hillcrest Drive, a street characterised by large, detached residential properties.

1.3 41 Hillcrest Drive lies adjacent to the west, whilst no residential properties lie immediately to the south or east. To the north are residential properties along Hillside which are predominantly two-storey dwellings, with the exception of bungalows at 28 and 30 Hillside. The host property shares a common boundary with 26 and 28 Hillside but has a relatively unobstructed view towards numbers 24, 26, 28 and 30.

1.4 Land levels on the site slope steeply downwards from south to north resulting in the properties along Hillside being set at a significantly lower land level than the host property.

1.5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

1.6 The balcony, constructed from timber, spans 6.4m across the rear elevation and projects 1.4m. The resultant external floor spaced created is approximately 9msq.

1.7 Due to the steep slope of the rear garden, the balcony is raised off the ground, supported by struts ranging from 1.3m to 2m in height, to sit level with the ground floor of the dwellinghouse.

1.8 Handrails at a height of 1m are proposed.

1.9 PLANNING HISTORY

DC/17/00681/HHA - Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, rear garden retaining wall, replacement of front tile hanging with cladding, pitched roof over garage and porch – Granted (08.09.2017)

DC/17/01348/HHA - Rear single storey extension, side two storey extension, rear garden retaining wall & replacement of front tile hanging with light grey render. Resubmission of previous application DC/17/00681/HHA Approved 07/09/17. Front cladding changed to grey render – Granted (17.01.2018)

2.0 Consultation Responses:

None received.

3.0 Representations:

3.1 Neighbour consultations were carried out in accordance with formal procedures introduced in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.

3.2 One representation has been received from Councillor Peter Maughan asking for this application to be referred to Planning Committee.

3.3 Four objections have been received from residents raising concerns with regard to:

- loss of privacy;
- overbearing;
- overlooking;
- And increased noise.

4.0 Policies:

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

CS14 Wellbeing and Health

CS15 Place Making

DC2 Residential Amenity

ENV3 The Built Environment - Character/Design

HAESPD Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD

5.0 Assessment of the Proposal:

5.1 The key considerations to be taken into account when assessing this planning application are set out below:

5.2 RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

5.3 Gateshead Council's HAESPD advises that applications for balconies will be considered with regard to their impact on the privacy of nearby residents. They will not normally be approved if there is significant overlooking of a neighbouring garden/yard or a main living window.

5.4 Whilst there is already a degree of overlooking because of the difference in land levels between the host property and the properties along Hillside, it is considered the projection of the balcony represents an additional and unacceptable increase in the opportunity for overlooking into both the main habitable windows and the gardens of the properties along Hillside.

5.5 Due to the size of the balcony, users could comfortably sit or stand prolonging the periods of time in which the balcony can be used. The handrails of the balcony are located approximately 10m from the common boundary with 26 and 28 Hillside, directly north. The presence of such a large balcony in such proximity and at such a height would have an almost constant overbearing impact on the residential amenity of the occupants below.

5.6 The balcony is considered to be fundamentally contrary to policy DC2 of the UDP, policy CS14 of the CSUCP, and Gateshead Council's HAESPD.

5.7 IMPACT ON PROPERTY AND AREA

5.8 Gateshead Council's HAESPD states that new extensions should not dominate an existing building's scale, and should always be subservient to the main building.

5.9 Due to the size and height of the structure as well as its projection from the rear elevation, the balcony is considered to be a significant and excessive addition to the property. It appears incongruous and dominates the rear elevation of the property to the detriment of the property and the wider area.

5.10 As such, the balcony is considered to be contrary to policy ENV3 of the UDP, policy CS15 of the CSUCP, and Gateshead Council's HAESPD.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 Taking all the relevant planning policies into account along with all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

7.0 Recommendation:

That permission be REFUSED for the following reason(s) and that the Strategic Director of Communities and Environment be authorised to add, vary and amend the refusal reasons as necessary

1

The balcony, by virtue of its scale, is considered to be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants in the properties to the rear. It would cause an unacceptable level of visual intrusion, as well as being overbearing. The development is therefore contrary to the NPPF, policy DC2 of the UDP, policy CS14 of the CSUCP, and the adopted HAESPD.

2

The balcony is a disproportionate addition that does not appear subordinate and dominates the rear elevation of the property to the detriment of the property and the wider area. The balcony therefore fails to respect the scale and design of the house, contrary to policy ENV3 of the UDP, policy CS15 of the CSUCP, and the adopted HAESPD.

