

16 & 15 Marina Approach UB4 9TB - Deminimus extension of existing balcony and re-siting of existing staircase – Supporting information

Background, neighbourly considerations & further information

Background

- Mr. James Craig of 16 Marina Approach and Mr Mikhael Deguzman of 15 Marina Approach are applying for a deminimus extension of the existing rear balconies of their residential properties.
 - After 26 years of existence, both balconies were in a desperate state beyond partial repair. The existing staircases and supporting frames of both balconies were unserviceable and become dangerous.
 - Both households decided to plan to replace both balconies and have a deminimus extension.
 - Before any work commenced on the rear balconies, consultation was sought with the neighbours No.14 and No.17 Marina Approach. We verbally discussed and they initially agreed that it would not be an issue. No.14 insisted on a partial screen and for increased privacy, which Mr. Deguzman of No.15 agreed to.
 - During this period, we also engaged No.12, Mr Ian McDonald who is a professional carpenter and who is also knowledgeable of the building designs of the community. He is also trusted by the neighbours.
 - Mr Deguzman & Mr Craig then approached No.17 to consult for their opinion on the addition of a screen and what their preference would be, along with the plans drafted by Mr. McDonald of No.12 which were supported by No.14.
 - The household of No.17 then changed their mind of allowing the deminimus extension that was initially discussed and to which we thought they had agreed.
- On dismantling and reconstruction of the original frame of the rear balconies two further redesigns were presented to No. 17 and No 14 to which they did not agree.

Further considerations by No.16 & 15

Extension Design Consideration

- The 1st design proposed by No.16 & No.15. was to align their balconies to the same extended length as No.14 & No.17, which has been done by house owners on the development with no staircase.
- Objection was "We would be level then" by No.14. No.17- "I do not want change, it ruins my view, "Provision of screen to negate was not agreed to by No.17 except next to existing wall on No.16. Back to the drawing board and no fence up to 2 metres at all.
- 2nd redesign with the assistance of Mr. McDonald (No.12) . He suggested a new design half the size of extension.
-Counter proposal & Objection No.14 wanted a screen. No.17 still did not want any change to anything and wants a view into No.16 & No.15's gardens.
- 3rd redesign by Mr. McDonald with new screen requested by No.14 added by No.15. She was happier, but then wanted a staircase put in place on the side.
.No.17 still did not want any change to anything and wants no change to his view into No.16 & No.15's gardens.
- 4th redesign by Mr. McDonald with slanted screen for No.15 and insertion of new staircase, Plus No.16. to have a totally different staircase design to appease no.17.
No.17 still did not want any change to anything and wants no change to his view into No.16 & No.15's gardens.
- 5th redesign by Mr. McDonald . New staircase design presented for No.15 and No.16, staircase redesign again.
Objection- No.14 – Staircase wanted even more recessed, 'actually I want no change, I've changed my mind'. NO.17 – I will not agree to any change at all
- 6th redesign is the current design by Mr. McDonald – further adaptations made, 14 step staircase special design rather than 11 steps with even smaller balcony extension of 600mm of useable space, with no line of sight issues.
This is the plan currently being applied for

Size of extension

- The size of the proposal has reduced 4 times starting from alignment to neighbours current balconies to where we are now to be additionally considerate to neighbours. We are now down to right down to a very small deminimus change.
- The usable extension is approximately 600m

Further considerations by No.16 & 15

Privacy

- Sympathetic additional screens have been provided for additional privacy to 14 as requested and agreed. A staircase has been provided as requested. Extra steps have been added as well for fast-depth
- The additional screening to protect No.17 viewpoints has also been added, along with new angle of the stairs and extra steps added for fast-depth
- The applicants (No.16 & 15) have requested that their privacy be protected by the direct view currently from both No.17 & No.14 who have denied there is an issue which is apparent from the original design flaw since the 1990's.

Access to light

- There is no loss of light for No.17 or No.14 due to the angle of additional screening provided by the applicants. The detriment remains with the applicants privacy as No.17 or No.14 appear to not want to increase privacy for the applicants.
- The properties at the rear have directly south facing gardens and loss of light is of no impact.

View

- The view lines from No.17 & No.14 have been considered as highlighted in the design changes.
- Additional screening has been added
- Extra stair steps have been added for fast-depth.
- The view for neighbours is not impacted as they are still very considerably extended from No.16 & No.15 and maintain their view.

Pre-Application Advice provided by Mr. John Allum 21/0916

- 'The proposed alterations are not material and are of a de minimus nature'. 'The drawings appeared to meet planning laws with regard to no reduction of light, privacy considerations being met and the views are not materially impacted'.

Note for attention

Note

- It should be noted that upon lodgement of this application, due to health and safety considerations, the previous balcony will be rebuilt. This will only be re-decked to the previous footprint and no increase in scope until the final planning committee decision on this application.
- We would be grateful if this is noted on the application and the planning computer system.