

THE CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

Phone (0191) 386 2595
Email chair@durhamcity.org
Web site: <http://www.DurhamCity.org>

c/o Blackett, Hart & Pratt, LLP
Aire House
Mandale Business Park
Belmont
Durham, DH1 1TH
26 October 2020

Dear Ms Hurton,

DM/20/02669/VOC 10 Red Hills Terrace Redhills Lane Crossgate Moor Durham DH1 4AX

Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission DM/17/04064/FPA to replace 1no window with a door within side elevation and replace single storey rear extension for a two storey rear extension

The City of Durham Trust is concerned whether the current application for variations goes far enough to identify impact issues that have emerged as the development has proceeded.

The sensitivity of the site lies in Redhills Lane, the terrace and its character, an important feature within the Conservation Area and also its relationship to the listed building opposite. The Trust concern is with low quality of design and construction resulting in negative impact.

The Trust maintains its view previously expressed that the awkwardly shaped mansard part slate/part Sarnofil roof at the rear is a negative addition to the terrace. What is clear now is that both this poor design solution and impacts on the existing front building are the result of forcing a third storey into the building where there was insufficient headroom or space.

In addition to the construction issue that the applicant raises, the Trust is concerned that the frontage first floor bay and window are cut through with a beam at glazing bar/opening window level (see annotated drawing and photograph below).



The drawing is our own approximate annotation over the applicant's submission showing how the floor positions might run through to the frontage, the photograph clearly shows the negative impact of the floor cutting through the bay and window.

The Trust query is whether this is acceptable under the original approval or needs further permission as a variation? As the floor split appears not to butt the window there may possibly be interpenetration of the lower apartment lounge through into the top floor apartment kitchen. Opening the windows may be prevented.

THE CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

The Trust position is that the floor design solution is unacceptable because of its negative impact on the street and is concerned that further adaptations behind the bay and window will exacerbate this. The unusual view will be that of residents' lower legs in the upper part of the windows and split lighting at night.

As the basement is a kitchen with a very limited exposed elevation to the frontage, are there any proposals for ventilation or other servicing that will appear on the street elevation?

Neither the original submission nor the new variation clarifies the construction need for the rear change in levels around the extension. Nor do they deal with the risk to, or the protection for, trees in the garden. The garden is very unsightly being filled with builders' waste throughout the very extended construction period. This is the frontage to this part of Flass Vale – an important natural resource. Any tree loss would be unacceptable.

The Trust does not raise an issue with the actual content of the variation application. However it seeks clarity about:

- The status and detailing of the floor division and intrusion into the frontage
- The layout and materials for any rear retaining wall construction
- The position, condition and any threat to trees in the garden area and any necessary protection
- The treatment of the garden area and its boundary with Flass Vale.
- A more minor point: will the front basement elevation be penetrated by any servicing or kitchen ventilation?

Yours sincerely

John Lowe

Chair, City of Durham Trust