## DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

**Ref No:** ST/0390/18/HFUL
**Proposal:** Demolition of existing garage and construction of a two-storey side extension to provide a porch, W.C, utility, kitchen, additional en-suite bedroom and bathroom.
**Location:** 3 West Drive
Cleadon
SR6 7SJ

**Site Visit Made:** 03/05/18

### Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A & B)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

### Description of the site and of the proposals

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached property, located on the south-west side of West Drive in Cleadon. The property is attached to the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling to the south-east, at 1 West Drive, and neighbours 5 West Drive, to the north-west, which is a semi-detached property that has had a two-storey side extension added. The street scene is characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties of a relatively consistent character, with a number of examples of two-storey side extensions, including examples close to the site at 5, 7, 9 and 17 West Drive.

The proposal seeks to add a two-storey side extension, which would also create a two-storey outrigger extending beyond the main rear wall of the existing property, to the side of an existing single-storey element. The proposals would necessitate the removal of a single-storey garage, set just to the rear of the property, at the side towards 5 West Drive.

A replacement roof for the existing single storey rear extension is also shown on the proposed plans. This falls within permitted development rights and does not therefore need to be included in the application description.

### Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 17/05/18)

**1) Neighbour responses**

None

### Assessment

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The main issues relevant to the assessment of this proposal are the;

- Design of the proposal and its impact on visual amenity; and
- Impact on residential amenity

Design/Visual Amenity

The key issues affecting consideration of the visual appearance of the proposed two-storey side extension are any effects that the extension would have in terms of its relationship with the host property, with the immediate neighbour, and the wider street scene. This includes consideration of whether the proposal would appear as subordinate to the host, whether it would give rise to any degree of terracing effect, and whether these effects would be harmful within the surrounding street scene.

Guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9 'Householder Developments' (at paragraph 7.2) advises that to achieve the desired subordinate appearance, and to minimise any terracing effect, two-storey side extensions on semi-detached properties should retain a minimum 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary of the application site, or provide a one third depth setback where a gap of less than 1 metre from the boundary is provided. The front of the extension is located 0.3 metres from the boundary, but provides a full one third depth setback, meeting this requirement of the SPD9 guidance.

The guidance also advises (paragraph 7.3) that 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 proposed side extension, measured at the front, is comfortably within this limit. The side extension increases in width further to the rear, remaining parallel with the property boundary line. While this exceeds the suggested width, this is set to the rear of the property and not visible within the street scene, and therefore considered not to be harmful.

The guidance in paragraph 7.2 also seeks the provision of a significantly lowered ridge line and a roof shape that corresponds to the main dwelling. The roof line of the extension is significantly lowered, however a gable roof extension is proposed, rather than a hipped roof like the main dwelling. Following discussions, the planning agent explained the reasons for choosing a gable roof over a hipped roof, and confirmed that a hipped roof had been considered during the design process, but that this would lead to practical difficulties in construction, as a hip to the main roof would have a pitch that would not align with that of the proposed rear offshoot roof, which would create a twisted or cranked roof form that would be very difficult to construct.

The gable roof extension does not correspond to the main property in the manner that a hipped roof would, and also adds additional massing to the proposed extension, when compared with a hipped roof. The majority of other roofs in the street scene are hipped roofs, with predominantly hipped roof extensions, although there are examples of other roof forms, such as the flat roofed two-storey side extensions at 9 and 17 West Drive.

Given the significant one-third depth setback of the extension from the front, equating to approximately 2.45 metres, and the substantially lowered ridgeline of the extension, both of which limit the massing of the extension and its prominence within the main street scene, it is considered that these factors reduce the impact of the different roof form, and its additional massing, to an acceptable level. It is not considered that the roof form would cause harm to a degree that would warrant the refusal of planning permission. It is considered that the proposed side extension would have a sufficient degree of visual subordinance within the street scene, and would not create a terracing effect.

While the proposal does have some degree of conflict with the design guidance in SPD9, it is considered on balance that, due to the particular site circumstances of this case, the development would not be unacceptably harmful in the context of the immediate street scene, and that the proposal would convey

sensitive consideration of its surroundings. The proposed development would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A) in this instance.

Residential Amenity

There are no habitable room windows in the side elevation of number 5 or in the side elevation of this proposal (other than a small high level window), meaning that no issues arise in respect of outlook/dominance or overlooking/privacy between the two side elevations. Habitable room windows are proposed only in the front and rear elevations of the proposed extension, with no side facing windows proposed within the elevation in the side/rear outrigger facing towards 1 West Drive, meaning that no overlooking or privacy impacts are possible in this direction.

The side/rear extension would project beyond the existing rear elevation of 5 West Drive by approximately 1.7 metres, and, while situated relatively close to the boundary with this property, it is considered that the limited extent of this projection would ensure that there would be no unacceptable dominance, or impacts upon the outlook from the rear of this property. While the proposals are likely to increase the overshadowing caused to a degree, it is considered that impacts in terms of overshadowing of rear habitable room windows or the rear garden would not be unacceptably harmful.

The side/rear extension would project approximately 2.2 metres beyond the main rear wall of 1 West Drive, but is set a substantial distance away from this boundary, with the existing single-storey structure situated between the proposed extension and 1 West Drive. It is not considered that the proposals would lead to unacceptable impacts on outlook from the property, or cause an unacceptable degree of overshadowing.

It is considered that the development would not unacceptably impact upon the residential amenity of neighbours in respect of overlooking or privacy of neighbours, in respect of the outlook from habitable room windows, over dominance, or overshadowing. It is considered that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to the amenities of neighbouring residents, and that the development is in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (B), while having regard to the design principles set in SPD 9.

Summary

While the proposal results in a degree of conflict with the design guidance set out in Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9 ‘Householder Developments’, it is considered that, in the site circumstances and context of this particular case, that the proposal would be in accordance with Local Development Framework (LDF) Policy DM1 (A & B), having regard to all other material planning considerations. The proposal would be an acceptable form of development, subject to the inclusion of the suggested conditions.

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

1727/P07 received 12 April 2018
1727/P05 received 12 April 2018
1727/P06 received 12 April 2018

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: Chris Stanworth**
**Signed:**
**Date: 07/06/18**

**Authorised Signatory:**
**Date:**

«END»