DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/1135/17/HFUL
Proposal: Removal of existing rear kitchen offshoot and detached side garage. Construction of a two storey side extension comprising a garage with en-suite bedroom above. Single storey rear family/kitchen/utility and wet room extension.
Location: 146 King George Road
SOUTH SHIELDS
NE34 0ET

Site Visit Made: 09/01/2018

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A and B)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

This application relates to a two storey east facing semi detached dwellinghouse in the established residential area of South Shields. The property has a detached garage to the north and to the rear there is a single storey flat roof projection. There is a porch and bay window to the front elevation. The property has a large garden to the rear which wraps around the northern side of the property.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey side extension to the northern elevation with a single storey canopy to its front elevation spanning across the existing porch, and a single storey extension to the rear elevation.

Planning History

None

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date: 08/01/2018)

1) **Neighbour responses**

None

2) **Other Consultee responses**

None

Assessment

In assessing this application due regard has been had to the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

The main considerations are the impacts the development will have on residential and visual amenity.

In terms of single storey rear extensions, SPD 9 states that single storey rear extensions that would extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house by up to 3 metres in respect of semi detached houses will generally be acceptable.

The single storey rear extension would project 3.8m beyond the rear elevation of the host property. This is in excess of that as set out in SPD 9. It is considered that given the orientation of the two properties there would be minimal loss of light to No.148 King George Road to the south. There would be no windows in the southern flank of the rear extension and so there would be no loss of privacy to No. 148. The proposed rear extension would be set 0.25m from the boundary with No. 148 King George Road to the south. The boundary fence is formed of a closed panel timber fence approximately 1.5m high. The rear extension's pitched roof would slope down to an eaves height of 3m. A rear extension of 3m projection could be built under permitted development rights. Therefore it is important to assess whether the extra 0.8m projection would result in significant further levels of harm to No. 148 over and above those that would be experienced by an extension of 3m projection. On balance it is not considered that a significant further level of outlook would be lost from the ground floor rear windows of No. 148 over and above that which would be experienced by an extension of 3m projection.

The single storey rear extension would be located 1.4m from the boundary with No. 144 King George Road to the north. That property has a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a conservatory extension to its rear along the shared boundary. Consequently it is not considered that the single storey element of the proposal would significantly harm the residential amenity of that property.

In terms of two storey side extensions, SPD 9 states that to achieve the desired subordinate appearance and to minimise any terracing effect, two-storey side extensions on semi-detached and high-density detached properties should:

- retain a minimum 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary of the application site;
- provide a minimum 1 metre set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and the main front wall of the house.
- provide a significantly lowered ridge line and a roof shape that corresponds to the main dwelling.

In situations where terracing would not arise, because there is no development immediately adjoining the location of the proposed extension, it may still be necessary to provide a set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and the main front wall of the house, and a lower ridge line, in order to achieve an appropriate design in the context of the street scene. In such situations an extension should always complement the scale, shape and proportions of the original dwelling, taking account of matters such as brick bonding, materials matching, roof design and the width of the proposed extension. Many of these design issues can be eliminated by use of a setback.

In having regard to the general principles set out in Section 3, consideration must be given to the width of the proposed side-extension in relation to the existing property. Side extensions which are excessively wide can undermine the character of the street and of the existing property. To maintain a reasonable level of subordination, side extensions should not be more than 3 metres in width or be more than half of the width of the original dwelling frontage, whichever is the greater.

The two storey side extension would be set 1.4m off the boundary and would be set back from the principal elevation of the host property by 1m. The roof of the ridge would be set significantly lower than

that of the host property. Consequently the side extension would appear subordinate to the host property and so would comply with SPD 9.

The two storey element of the proposal would be obscured from No. 148 King George Road to the south by the main bulk of the host property.

Given the presence of the two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conservatory extension to the rear of No. 144, King George Road, it is not considered that the two storey element of the proposal would significantly harm the residential amenity of that property.

The canopy extension to the front of the side extension would have no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

In terms of design, the pitched roof design of the rear extension is acceptable. The hipped roof design of the side extension is acceptable. Given the distance to the northern boundary, no terracing would occur.

The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing garage. However, a garage would be created at ground floor level in the two storey side extension and therefore the level of parking provision at the site would be unchanged. This is acceptable.

In conclusion the proposal would comply with all relevant local and national planning policy and so is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

Grant Permission Householder with Conditions

Conditions

1 The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to ensure that the development is carried out within a reasonable time.

2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan(s) as detailed below

Dwg No. C-02 Rev B received 20/12/2027

Any minor material changes to the approved plans will require a formal planning application under S73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary this condition and substitute alternative plans.

In order to provide a procedure to seek approval of proposed minor material change which is not substantially different from that which has been approved.

3 The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be of similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building on which the

extension will form part. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to this condition.

To ensure a satisfactory standard of development and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with South Tyneside LDF Development Management Policy DM1.

Informatives

1 In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 186 & 187) to seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

2 The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848.

Further information is also available on the Coal Authority website at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority

Case officer: Seán Gallagher
Signed:
Date: 10/01/2017

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»