

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 2nd October, 2013.

Present: Cllr Robert Gibson(Chair), Cllr Gillian Corr(Vice Chair), Cllr Mark Chatburn, Cllr Carol Clark (Vice-Cllr Jim Beall), Cllr Michael Clark (Vice Cllr Paul Kirton), Cllr Jean Kirby, Cllr Maureen Rigg(Vice-Cllr Alan Lewis), Cllr David Rose, Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E, Cllr Mick Stoker, Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Carol Straughan, Andrew Glossop, Joanne Hutchcraft, Barry Jackson,(DNS), Peter Bell, Julie Butcher, Sarah Whaley,(L&D)

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents and Members of the public

Apologies: Cllr Jim Beall, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Alan Lewis, Cllr Steve Walmsley

P Declarations of Interest

60/13

There were no declarations of interest.

P 13/1391/FUL

61/13

**1 The Green, Eggescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees
Application for erection of two storey extension to the rear**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 13/1391/FUL 1 The Green, Eggescliffe, Stockton on Tees, application for erection of two storey extension to the rear.

The application site was situated at the end of a terrace within the Conservation Area of The Green, Eggescliffe. The two storey property was adjoined by No 2 (North West) with Rose Cottage to the front (South West). A farm track ran to the side/south east of the site, leading to properties along Wells Cottages (North East).

The main planning considerations with respect to the application related to the impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Conservation Area, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, highway safety and car parking.

No objections had been received from the Head of Technical Services. The Council's Historic Buildings Officer had also raised no objections.

Neighbouring properties were notified and a total of 8 objections had been received from No 2 The Green Eggescliffe, 1 - 2 Wells Cottages Eggescliffe (submitted on behalf of No 2 The Green); 6 Butts Lane Eggescliffe, 21 Kilburn Road Stockton (Lonsdale); 11 Crockford Close Addlestone, 69 Glaisdale Road, Yarm, Orchard House, Church Road, and 43 Butterfly Meadows, Beverley.

The objections included the proposal being out of character with the property and area; the impact on the amenity (including loss of light) of No 2, a previous application was refused for a two storey rear extension at the site, property devaluation and drainage matters.

Concerns had also been received from the Parish Council with respect to the

proposal increasing the number of bedrooms and whether the necessary in curtilage car parking could be achieved.

The proposal was considered to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS3, Local Plan saved Policies EN24 and HO12, Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG2/SPD3) and the National Planning Policy Framework as it was considered that the extension would be of a suitable design for the existing property (and site) and would not adversely impact on the Eggescliffe Conservation Area. It was further considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties or result in a loss of highway safety. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

An objector was in attendance at the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Her comments could be summarised as follows:

- The Garden at property No.2 was very small and therefore the addition of the extension would take away the majority of the natural daylight.
- Currently there was already a 4 metre hedge in the garden of No.1 The Green which was situated alongside the boundary of No.1 and No.2 The Green. This already cast a shadow into the garden at No.2 and it was felt that the additional extension would take away any remaining light.
- There would be constant and permanent shadow on the house at No. 2 The Green.
- 50% of the house would be darker and would therefore require electric lighting in summer and winter during daylight hours.
- Due to the additional darkness the objector felt that the house would be more susceptible to damp and require extra cleaning.
- During periods of heavy snow the lack of light would prevent snow melting resulting in large amounts of snow slippage from the roof to the back door entrance of the property.

The applicant was in attendance at the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- No.1 The Green was purchased 10 years ago and due to his expanding family the applicant wanted to extend the property rather than move house.
- Houses in the village had already acquired planning permission for similar extensions.
- The proposed extension was in keeping with the rest of the houses in the village and the applicant had done their best to make it look nice for themselves and their neighbours.
- An opaque window had been included on the side elevation of the proposed extension to minimise the neighbour from being overlooked.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the

application and these could be summarised as follows:

- The number of properties on the Green which already had 2 storey extensions.
- Cllr Maureen Rigg explained to the Committee that she had visited the site herself and supplied the Committee with a photo showing the boundary line of the back garden of No.1 The Green, and No. 2 The Green, and informed Members that the proposed extension would only be 10cms inset from No.2 and would almost be at the eaves of the property.
- No.2 The Green was possibly one of the smallest houses on The Green and therefore the proposed extension would have a bigger impact than that if it was larger.
- Concerned that HO12 and SPG2 had not been followed in respect of significant loss of amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties and minimising overbearing.
- Members asked officers if an assurance could be given that shadowing would not occur as a result of the extension. The officer confirmed that as the extension would extend to the east and property No.2 was to the north of this, the extension would ultimately create shadow on the patio area of No.2 which is not an uncommon occurrence for extensions to any terraces of similar orientations.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 13/1391/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives below:-

1. The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);

| Plan Reference Number | Date on Plan |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| SBC0001 | 11 June 2013 |
| 3/4 REV 3 | 16 September 2013 |
| 1/4 REV 4 | 13 September 2013 |
| 2/4 REV 4 | 13 September 2013 |

2. Notwithstanding the submitted information, construction of the external walls and roof, and installation of windows, shall not commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces and windows of the structures hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

3. The proposed first floor window to be located within the rear (north east) elevation of the proposed two storey rear extension hereby approved, serving a bedroom (as detailed on plan 2/4 Rev 4, dated 13th September 2013), shall be fixed and obscurely glazed using a minimum of type 4 opaque glass. The approved scheme shall remain for lifetime of the development hereby approved.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

The Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- P
62/13**
- 1. Appeal - Mr Lee McStravick - High Bridge Paddock, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe - 12/0505/FUL - DISMISSED**
 - 2. Appeal - S Thompson & Son - Town Farm Old stillington - 12/2168/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
 - 3. Appeal - William Noble Ltd - 128 High Street Stockton - 13/0432/COU - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**

RESOLVED that the appeals be noted.