DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0255/18/HFUL
Proposal: Demolition of existing garage, two storey extension at side of dwelling house to provide reception room and enlarged bathroom at ground floor and an additional bedroom/en-suite at first floor.
Location: 60 Prince Edward Road
South Shields
NE34 7PL

Site Visit Made: 22/05/2018

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 northwest facing hipped roof semi detached property in the established residential area of South Shields. The property is located on the corner of Prince Edward Road and Sunderland Road. A roundabout forms the junction between the two roads. The front building line curves from the east to the south. The property has a single storey front extension, a single storey rear extension and a small single storey side extension. There is a detached garage to the southwest. The property is set within a triangular plot with a modest garden to the rear and a large paved garden to the front. There is a vehicular access onto Prince Edward Road to the north.

The site has no relevant planning history.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey hipped roof side extension. The existing garage would be demolished. The extension would also have a single storey pitched roof element to the front, which would tie into the existing single storey front extension. Amended plans have been received, reducing the height, width and depth of the proposed side extension, and also amending the existing and proposed driveway location.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 17/05/2018)

1) Neighbour responses

None

2) Other Consultee responses

Traffic & Road Safety
(response received in relation to plans initially submitted)

Existing Site/Roof Plan is incorrect and shows the driveway access in the wrong location. The plan requires amending to show the existing location of the driveway access. We would refuse a driveway crossing in the location shown as it would enter directly onto the roundabout which raises road safety concerns. Unless the access is revised, the application should be refused.

Case Officer Comment: The plans were initially incorrect and have subsequently been amended to correctly show the driveway position.

Assessment

Impact upon Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would be located a minimum of 0.6m (due to the tapering boundary) from the boundary with No. 307 Sunderland Road to the south. Given the orientation of the two properties, there would be no overshadowing to No. 307 as a result of the proposal. Whilst there would be two new windows at ground floor level facing the boundary with No. 307, these would be obscurely glazed and so there would be no loss of privacy to that property. No. 307 is set 4m from the proposed extension. The proposed rear building line of the extension would not project beyond the rear building line of No. 307. Furthermore, that property has an existing garage located upon the boundary. Consequently, it is not considered that the proposed side extension would result in any significant loss of outlook to No. 307 Sunderland Road.

Given the proposed extension's location, it would be obscured from the adjoining semi, No. 62 Prince Edward Road by the main bulk of the existing host property. Consequently there would be no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of that property.

Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Area

In terms of design, SPD9 dictates that two storey side extensions should provide a minimum 1 metre set back at first floor level, and provide a significantly lowered ridge line and roof shape. Furthermore, 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.

SPD9 states that side extension should retain a minimum 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary of the application site. It also notes that in situations where terracing would not occur, as is the case here due to the angles the properties are set at, this may not be necessary, however 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 also a lower ridge line, in order to achieve an appropriate design in the context of the street scene.

The design of the proposal has been amended from as originally submitted and now complies with SPD9. This is considered to be acceptable.

There are a number of two storey side extensions in the vicinity and so it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Impact upon Traffic and Road Safety

The proposal would lead to the loss of 1no. car parking space in the garage. However, there would be ample car parking space upon the existing driveway and so this is considered to be acceptable. The Council's Traffic & Highway Safety Team initially raised concerns about the driveway existing onto the adjacent highway. However, this transpired to be a mistake on the plans, which have subsequently been amended to correctly show the driveway exiting onto Prince Edward Road.

Conclusion

In conclusion it is considered that the proposal would have no significant adverse impact upon residential amenity, the character and appearance of the area, or traffic and road safety. The proposal complies with all relevant local and national planning policies. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval.

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

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:

Sheet 2 received 09/07/18
Sheet 3 received 09/07/18
Sheet 4 received 09/07/18
Sheet 5 received 09/07/18

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 an area that has been defined by the Coal Authority as containing potential hazards arising from former coal mining activity. These hazards can include: mine entries (shafts and adits); shallow coal workings; geological features (fissures and break lines); mine gas and previous surface mining sites. Although such hazards are seldom readily visible, they can often be present and problems can occur in the future, particularly as a result of development taking place.

It is recommended that information outlining how the former mining activities affect the proposed development, along with any mitigation measures required

(for example the need for gas protection measures within the foundations), be submitted alongside any subsequent application for Building Regulations approval (if relevant). Any form of development over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry can be dangerous and raises significant safety and engineering risks and exposes all parties to potential financial liabilities. As a general precautionary principle, the Coal Authority considers that the building over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry should wherever possible be avoided. In exceptional circumstance where this is unavoidable, expert advice must be sought to ensure that a suitable engineering design is developed and agreed with regulatory bodies which takes into account of all the relevant safety and environmental risk factors, including gas and mine-water. Your attention is drawn to the Coal Authority Policy in relation to new development and mine entries available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-on-or-within-the-influencing-distance-of-mine-entries

Any intrusive activities which disturb or enter any coal seams, coal mine workings or coal mine entries (shafts and adits) requires a Coal Authority Permit. Such activities could include site investigation boreholes, digging of foundations, piling activities, other ground works and any subsequent treatment of coal mine workings and coal mine entries for ground stability purposes. Failure to obtain a Coal Authority Permit for such activities is trespass, with the potential for court action.

Property specific summary information on past, current and future coal mining activity can be obtained from: www.groundstability.com or a similar service provider.

If any of the coal mining features are unexpectedly encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848. Further information is available on the Coal Authority website at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority

Case officer: Seán Gallagher
Signed:
Date: 09/07/2018

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»