

MINOR UPDATE

Application No:	DC/18/01112/FUL
Site:	Land to Side And Rear Of Field View Lead Road Greenside Ryton NE40 4JT
Proposal:	VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 (approved plans) of DC/15/00700/FUL to allow increase in footprint, repositioning of garage, removal of turret, amendments to roof and alterations to fenestration detailing.
Ward:	Crawcrook And Greenside
Recommendation:	Grant Permission
Application Type	Full Application

Reason for Minor Update

Further representations made, and further consultation response received.

Additional Representations

Two additional representations have been received and are summarised as follows;

- The proposed increase in the building footprint is not 'minor' as suggested by the Committee Report. The proposal results in a 15% increase in footprint.
- The submitted comparison plans (provided by the applicant) indicate different dimensions than those shown on the original plans e.g. the width of the building is 115mm shorter on the comparison drawing.
- There is discrepancy between the submitted Design and Access Statement and the submitted plans. The Design and Access Statement states the building has been located '*3m from the north west boundary, as suggested by the local authority*' when in fact it is 2.5 metres from the boundary.
- The distance between the proposed development and Field View has been reduced from 10.3 metres to 8.23 metres; this distance should be 21 metres. This amendment would have a dramatic impact on residential amenity for both Field View and further occupiers (owing to the use of obscure glazing).
- The change in roof form (from hip to gable) and heights would again impact on amenity of both Field View and Hollyholme.

- The applicant has not provided sufficient information to allow an informed decision to be made owing to changes in land levels between the site and Field View.
- The objector disagrees that the existing dwellinghouse (at Field View) would have a screening impact owing to the proposed height of the proposed dwellinghouse.
- The developer has breached planning conditions associated with the previous planning approval, specific concern has been raised around;
 - The impact on trees and;
 - The lack of intrusive site investigations.
- The officer report fails to address all objections raised by residents including the 'overbearing' nature of the proposal.

Officers are of the view that the information contained within the Committee Report in conjunction with the proposed plans provides sufficient information to allow the determination of the application. Further, it is considered that the description of the increase in the building footprint as 'minor' is appropriate in the context of the amendments proposed.

Officers are of the view that the submitted comparison plans are sufficiently accurate and fit for purpose, the plans will not be included within the list of approved documents.

Discrepancies between the submitted Design and Access Statement and plans is not material, the assessment has been made based on the submitted plans. The separation distance of 2.5 metres between the proposed dwelling and the north west boundary is acceptable.

In assessing the previous application (DC/15/00700/FUL), Officers acknowledged the separation distances between Field View;

"The separation distance of between 10.3m and 13.5m to the rear of Field View doesn't meet the Council's Household Design Guidance relating to two-storey extensions, given the change in land levels. However these figures form only guidance and ultimately each case must be considered on its own merits against adopted policy."

However, it was concluded given the orientation of the dwellings, the nature of the windows proposed and scale of the proposal that amenity would not be impacted to an unacceptable degree. Officers have considered the amended scheme in the same context and the proposed amendments are not considered not to impact to a degree which would warrant refusal of the application.

The amendment to the roof design has been considered within the wider assessment of the proposal. It is not considered that this amendment either on its own or cumulatively would impact to an unacceptable degree on any neighbouring property.

While limited information on land levels has been provided, based upon the submitted plans and site visits conducted by officers, it is considered sufficient information is available to allow a full and considered assessment of the proposal to be made.

Officers disagree that any breach of planning conditions has occurred. While site clearance works have been undertaken these works fall outside of the scope of the original application. Further, the applicant has submitted sufficient information (in support of the current application) in regard to the site access, tree protection and land stability.

Regarding contaminated land, it is recommended by officers that an additional planning condition be added to the recommendation. The condition should require the submission of a site investigation and (where necessary) a remediation strategy if any contaminated material is found during the development of the site.

It is the view of officers that all material planning considerations raised by objectors were addressed within the body of the Committee Report.

Additional Consultation Response

Further to paragraph 2.0 of the Committee Report the Coal Authority have amended their consultation response. Their view is that sufficient information has been submitted in regard to coal mining legacy issues.

As such, it is considered that the recommendation should be amended so that Conditions 8 – 12 will either be removed or become compliance conditions (as opposed to requiring the submission of further information).

SEE MAIN AGENDA FOR OFFICERS REPORT.